I. Pledge of Allegiance
II. Oath of Office
III. Safety Briefing
IV. Public Comment:
V. Advisory Committee Updates:
   1. Update on the Customer Satisfaction Advisory Committee (CSAC)
   2. Update on the Access Advisory Committee (AAC).
VI. Board Committee Updates:
   1. CAMPO update
VII. Consent Items
   1. Approval of Minutes from the October 23, 2017 Board Meeting and
      October 24, 2017 Board Worksession.
   2. Approval of the 2018 Capital Metro Board Meeting Calendar
VIII. Action Items:
   1. Approval of the appointment of Jeffrey Travillion to the Operations,
      Planning and Safety Committee, and ___________ as Committee Chairperson.
   2. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee,
      to implement the June 2018 Service Changes.
   3. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee,
      to extend an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin for employee transit
      passes for a period of 1 year from January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2018, and
      leave the CY2018 contract term not-to-exceed amount unchanged at $400,000.
   4. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee,
      to finalize and execute a contract modification with Krauthamer & Associates for
      executive recruiting services to increase the amount by $87,000 for a total not to
      exceed contract amount of $648,000 for one year with four 12 month options.
5. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute a contract with Bytemark, Inc. for the implementation of software upgrades to the trip planning and traveler tools system in an amount not to exceed $373,460 for one-time implementation costs plus a one-year option of $98,628 for a total not to exceed $472,088.

6. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to execute a contract with Creative Bus Sales, utilizing the Buy Board Purchasing Cooperative, to purchase up to twenty-two Champion Paratransit Vans in an amount not to exceed $2,117,371.

7. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to extend and confirm the termination date of the existing Bus Stop Accessibility Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin on May 22, 2019.

IX. Presentations:

1. Review of proposed changes to Capital Metro Board Bylaws.

X. Reports:

1. Quarterly Planning and Ridership Report
2. President/CEO Update

XI. Items for Future Discussion:

XII. Adjournment

ADA Compliance

Reasonable modifications and equal access to communications are provided upon request. Please call (512)389-7458 or email gina.estrada@capmetro.org if you need more information.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Wade Cooper, Chair; Delia Garza, Vice Chair; Juli Word, Board Secretary; Terry Mitchell, Pio Renteria, Jeffrey Travillion, Rita Jonse and Ann Kitchen. Board Liaison: Gina Estrada (512)389-7458, email gina.estrada@capmetro.org if you need more information.

The Board of Directors may go into closed session under the Texas Open Meetings Act. In accordance with Texas Government Code, Section 551.071, consultation with attorney for any legal issues, under Section 551.072 for real property issues; under Section 551.074 for personnel matters, or under Section 551.076, for deliberation regarding the deployment or implementation of security personnel or devices; arising regarding any item listed on this agenda.
TITLE: Update on the Customer Satisfaction Advisory Committee (CSAC)
Call to Order:
Chairman David Foster, CSAC

Chairman Foster called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

Introductions:

Committee members present were Chairman David Foster, Bettye Taylor, and Betsy Greenberg.

Staff members present were Sam Sargent and Caitlin D’Alton

Members of the public present were Caleb Pritchard and Elizabeth Stehl.

June 2018 Service Change Proposal and Revisions:
Ms. Caitlin D’Alton, Senior Planner, Capital Metro

Ms. D’Alton presented on the June 2018 Service Change proposal and the revisions that were presented to the Board of Directors on November 1st, 2017. Ms. D’Alton highlighted the reduction in the number of impacted MetroAccess clients, which has been of concern to the committee.

Chairman Foster asked if any decisions had been made yet on “grandfathering” in the 36 remaining MetroAccess clients whose home addresses would be affected by the changes. Ms. D’Alton replied that that was a decision the Board would still need to make.
Committee Attendance and Mission Discussion:
Chairman David Foster, CSAC

Chairman Foster reviewed committee attendance over the past year and asked that an extended discussion of membership, attendance, mission, and bylaws be placed on the December agenda. Ms. Greenberg recommended that the advisory committee pages be made more prominent on the main webpage, along with the agendas and minutes.

Mr. Sargent stated that he would look into this and ensure that the minutes and agendas are up to date in their current locations on the website. The committee will also consider moving the location of the meeting to a more prominent, open space, such as the new Central Library.

Consideration of a Statement to the Board on the June 2018 Service Changes:
Chairman David Foster, CSAC

The committee will review language via email that reiterates the committee’s original Connections 2025 support resolution from February and includes additional language thanking Capital Metro staff for the revisions that have been made, urging staff to closely monitor the performance of the new routes, continue to work on Mobility Innovation Zones, and consider “grandfathering” MetroAccess clients whose home address eligibility would be effected by the June 2018 changes.

Adjournment:

The committee adjourned at 7:30 p.m.
TITLE: Update on the Access Advisory Committee (AAC).
Call to Order:

Vice Chairman Paul Hunt, Access Advisory Committee

Vice Chairman Hunt called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Introductions:

Committee members present were Chairman Chris Prentice, Vice Chairman Paul Hunt, Cheryl Hunt, Molly Birrell, John McNabb, and Tom Turner.

Capital Metro staff members present were Chad Ballentine, Kendall Jackson, Martin Kareithi,

Capital Metro contractor staff present were.

Citizen and Committee Communication:

Members of the public present included Cheryl Hunt and Paul Hunt.

Mrs. Cheryl Hunt

Mrs. Hunt complimented Raoul, who helped her set up a profile and subscription for a new Sunday trip. She also had comments about the new Ride Right vans. They are not accessible to people with balance issues, and only one service dogs fits per van. Also, she had an issue where another passenger was playing music on their phone too loud. She wishes that paratransit could follow the same guidelines as fixed route so that playing music would not be allowed.

Chad: The passenger was contacted and now knows the rules. The rules state that passengers must “ride quietly” – as some people are not able to use headphones.

Also, Mrs. Hunt has noticed that when there are “add-ons” to trips, they are often not noticed by the drivers. Some drivers use the print manifesto, which could be an older version.
Brenda Hernandez: They will retrain drivers so that they know to look at the electronic manifesto.

Mr. Paul Hunt

Mr. Hunt said that there are still issues at St. Paul, even though there was a site visit. He filed a complaint yesterday about how drivers do handoffs and where Howard Station is. He pointed out a possible problem with how complaints are handled: Cap Metro receives them and then passes them to the contractor, but there is seemingly no follow-up back to Cap Metro and then to the customer. He wishes the Committee would advise more actively – like in the issue with the Ride Right vans that Cheryl discussed. The Committee could have advised on the procurement.

MetroAccess Statistics & Technology Update
*Chad Ballentine, Director of Paratransit, Capital Metro*

There is no statistics update because it is the 1st of the month. The annual Trapeze upgrade is about to happen. Chair Prentice asked if the procurement for the new software is up yet. It is not, but Chad believes it will be in Spring 2018.

Pickup Pilot Update
*Chad Ballentine, Director of Paratransit, Capital Metro*

Pickup has begun service six days a week, and now serves MLK Station. It will continue through May at the latest. The hours are Monday through Friday 7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m., and Saturday 10:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.

New Business

**Proposed June 2018 Service Change**
*Caitlin D’Alton, Senior Planner*

Caitlin D’Alton presented on the most recent version of the June 2018 service changes. Upon comment from the committee, the team will look at the sidewalk at Burnet & Braker to confirm whether or not the South side of the street has sidewalks. Paul Hunt asked how to get to St. David’s North campus, and Caitlin responded that there is not transit option, but the destination is still MetroAccess eligible because of Route 325 on Metric.

Chair Prentice: I was under the impression that if people were going to lose MetroAccess service, Cap Metro would make sure there would be something in its place. This is based on the resolution from the Access Advisory Committee that the
Board adopted. Now, the recommendation from the Committee would be to grandfather the 36 affected people into MetroAccess.

Chad: There is barely any precedent for grandfathering people into service. But from his read on the Board, they seem like they will exempt MetroAccess from being affected by the November vote.

Chair Prentice: Motioned to recommend that the Board grandfather MetroAccess customers that do not have a reasonable transportation alternative. This motion carried unanimously. Chair Prentice or Vice Chair Hunt will present this motion to the Board.

Action Items

Future Agenda Items

Paul and Glenda visited the MetroAccess dispatch center and would like to bring a report back to the Committee next month.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the September AAC meeting were approved unanimously.

Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 6:54 p.m.
Approval of Minutes from the October 23, 2017 Board Meeting and October 24, 2017 Board Worksession.
I. Pledge of Allegiance

II. Oath of Office

This item was postponed until a question about Commissioner Travillion’s eligibility to serve on the board has been answered.

III. Safety Briefing

Darryl Jamail, Director of Safety, provided the safety briefing for the month. Halloween is next week and Mr. Jamail reminded everyone to be safe. Exercise caution when driving and be vigilant of trick-or-treaters crossing the street. If you have young children, make sure they wear reflective gear or carry a flashlight. Also, use Capital Metro transit service for travel downtown to Halloween festivities.

IV. Public Comment:

John Laycock of the group AURA spoke in favor of Connections 2025 service changes and supports frequent service. He provided an analysis on how frequent service is more beneficial than coverage in the Austin area.

Darrell Sorrells, bus operator, expressed safety concerns with some bus stop shelters - in particular, Berkman and Briarcliff and ACC Riverside. He stated the new Gillig 2600 buses are coming in contact with these fixed objects. He feels it is unfair that a 21-year veteran operator was fired after she came into contact with a shelter. Next, he reported there are 30 accidents a month of this type. Lastly, he spoke against the proposed Connections 2025 service changes.

Board member Kitchen asked Capital Metro’s President/CEO to follow up on safety issues discussed by Mr. Sorrells.

Ruven Brooks, shared poverty count information he has gathered from the US census that indicates low income families are still in Austin but have moved to other locations. Mr. Brooks feels the new service changes will better serve the low income riders. He believes the proposed service changes are good and supports the changes.

Angela Rangel, representing PODER, stated the previous speaker was reporting poverty count information from a 2010 US census data and not from the most recent study conducted by the Kerwin Institute. Ms. Rangel opposes the June 2018 service changes in particular routes 323, 4 and 17. She believes staff should do more public outreach, i.e., ride the bus to educate the community about the changes.

May Taylor, spoke in support of the proposed 2018 service changes and is looking forward to the high frequency routes that are being proposed.

Ms. Davis, customer, shared a few of her experiences and insights with the board.
Zenobia Joseph had remarks regarding our board minute meetings. While the videos are online, she feels they are sometimes spliced and the board minutes do not capture the discussions in their entirety, in particular issues and concerns related to Connections 2025. She suggested we go back and address the issues. Ms. Joseph does not agree with some of the proposed changes and feels northeast Austin has been gutted where there are people of color and rerouted to areas like Westgate where people are white. Chair Cooper asked Ms. Joseph what she thought of the comment about changes making service more frequently to low income riders. Ms. Joseph answered it does not provide coverage and does not take the ½ mile walk into consideration. She recommended we quantify the number of people who would have to walk the ½ mile prior to making the final changes.

V. Advisory Committee Updates:

1. Update on the Customer Satisfaction Advisory Committee (CSAC)

Kendall Jackson, Community Involvement, gave the update. The committee met on October 12 and approved the August minutes. In addition, the committee heard a presentation on Connections 2025.

2. 3965 : Update on the Access Advisory Committee (AAC)

Kendall Jackson, Community Involvement team, gave the AAC update. The committee met on October 4 and approved the September minutes. In addition, the committee heard the following presentations:

- MetroAccess Monthly Statistic Report
- Georgetown & Round Rock Fixed Route Service Update

Board members had the following comments/observations:

Board member Kitchen - Do we have a full quorum on the advisory committees? She would like to hear directly from the advisory committee chairs on how the committees are doing.

Chairman Cooper - Would like to hear from the advisory committee chairs as well. Would like a report to the board about the advisory committees’ attendance, appointees and how appointments are made. He suggested we may want to recommend a change to the process if we are not receiving robust feedback from the committees.

VI. Board Committee Updates:

1. Finance, Audit and Administration Committee; and

Terry Mitchell, Committee Chair, presented the update for the Finance, Audit and Administration Committee. The committee met October 13 and had one action item - CAMPO ILA extension. That item is on today's consent agenda. The committee also heard the following presentations:

- Internal Audit External Quality Assurance Review Report
- Internal Audit Utilities Management Audit Report
- Public Perception Survey
- August Financial Report

2. CAMPO update

Board member Mitchell, Capital Metro's CAMPO representative was unable to attend this month's CAMPO meeting. He is scheduled to meet with the CAMPO director and will report back to the board.

VII. Consent Items

1. Approval of Board Minutes for the September 14, 2017 Public Hearing and Special Board Meetings and the September 29, 2017 Board Meeting.
2. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to amend an existing Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization for employee transit passes to extend the term of the agreement for a period from December 1, 2017, until November 30, 2018, with a contract amount not to exceed $5,000.

VIII. Action Items:

1. Approval of a Vice Chair for the Capital Metro Board of Directors.

   Board member Delia Garza was nominated and elected as Vice Chair.

   | RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS] |
   | MOVER: Ann Kitchen, Board Member |
   | SECONDER: Terry Mitchell, Board Member |
   | AYES: Mitchell, Word, Cooper, Garza, Kitchen, Jonse, Renteria |

2. Chair of the Committee and Committee Member

   This item was postponed until the next Board of Directors meeting.

3. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with Lower Colorado River Authority (LCRA) for radio communication equipment and services for a period of five years in an amount not to exceed $4,093,000.

   Andrew Murphy, Manager, Vehicle Maintenance Standards and Projects, presented this item. Since 2002, LCRA has provided Capital Metro with two-way radio communication infrastructure for all buses, trains, vans, cars, trucks, and personnel. LCRA provides airtime, equipment, and services. Equipment includes in-vehicle and handheld radios, dispatch consoles, broadcast towers, and microwave antennas. Services include installation and ongoing maintenance of equipment.

   | RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS] |
   | MOVER: Rita Jonse, Board Member |
   | SECONDER: Juli Word, Secretary |
   | AYES: Mitchell, Word, Cooper, Garza, Kitchen, Jonse, Renteria |

4. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to negotiate, finalize and execute an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Leander through which the City of Leander will contribute at least $75,000 to Capital Metro to construct a trail connecting the Leander MetroRail Station to Mel Mathis Boulevard. Capital Metro will contribute the remaining funding to construct the trail. Upon construction completion, the City of Leander will own, operate, and maintain the trail.

   Nadia Barrera-Ramirez, Project Manager, Capital Projects, presented this item. The Leander Trail project will include a bridge and associated lighting for safety and security of pedestrians and bicyclists using the trail to access ACC and other adjacent land uses.

   Board member Jonse asked the following question: What is Capital Metro’s share of the project? Staff’s response: $311,000
5. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute a contract with Allied Universal Security for Unarmed Security Officer Services for a period of three years with two 1-year options for an amount not to exceed $6,861,651.

Blair Spikes, Security Administrator, presented this item. The unarmed security officers employed under this contract perform a variety of security duties including access control, patrolling throughout our facilities, and monitoring of passive/active electronic systems 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Two security facets of major importance to the agency are our security monitoring systems and personnel. The recommended contractor provides excellence in both.

Board member Jonse had questions regarding training for these security officers. Lastly, Chairman Cooper would like to hear a presentation on Capital Metro’s Safety and Security Program.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Juli Word, Secretary
SECONDER: Terry Mitchell, Board Member
AYES: Mitchell, Word, Cooper, Garza, Kitchen, Jonse, Renteria

6. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute contracts with Austin Architecture Plus, Carson Design Associates, Jackson & McElhaney Architects, and McKinney York Architects for Architectural and Engineering Rotational Services for one base year and four, one year renewable options in an aggregate amount not to exceed $1,950,000.

Ken Cartwright, Vice President, Capital Projects, presented this item. Similar to the last action item, Capital Metro employees architecture and engineer services to design and build facility infrastructure projects.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Rita Jonse, Board Member
SECONDER: Juli Word, Secretary
AYES: Mitchell, Word, Cooper, Garza, Kitchen, Jonse, Renteria

7. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute contracts with Doucet & Associates, Inc., Halff Associates, Inc., Huitt-Zollars, Inc., MWM DesignGroup and RPS, for Civil Engineering rotational services for one base year and four, one year renewable options in an aggregate amount not to exceed $2,500,000.

Ken Cartwright, Vice President, Capital Projects, presented this item. Capital Metro routinely utilizes civil engineering rotational contracts for design facility infrastructure improvements. Some recent projects where we’re utilizing these services include the design of Westgate Park & Ride; addition of MetroRapid Stations; and the Lakeline and Howard Park & Ride expansions.
RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Terry Mitchell, Board Member
SECONDER: Ann Kitchen, Board Member
AYES: Mitchell, Word, Cooper, Garza, Kitchen, Jonse, Renteria

8. Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute a contract with C.D.L. Electric Company, Inc. to equip the Loyola Lane and FM 969 rail crossings to comply with Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) quiet zone regulatory requirements on the East Subdivision for freight operations. The total amount for this project shall not exceed $595,897.

Alvin Algarin, Rail Operations, presented this item. This action will allow Capital Metro to improve rail freight operation and safety at the Loyola Lane and FM969 locations, removing the requirement for freight trains to sound their horns. These modifications to the crossing configuration will allow this crossing to meet the FRA’s regulatory requirements for a quiet zone.

Discussion ensued with board member Jonse expressing interest in the FRA requirements and approval process for quiet zones. Chairman Cooper sought reassurance that funding is consistent with standards for establishing quiet zones and that we’re not jumping ahead of others on the list.

Elaine Timbes, Chief Operating Officer, stated we have other quiet zones in this community that are already in place, are completed and are active. These are the only two quiet zones that are pending and are funded in this year’s budget for completion. We will provide a list of quiet zones to the Board.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Rita Jonse, Board Member
SECONDER: Terry Mitchell, Board Member
AYES: Mitchell, Word, Cooper, Garza, Kitchen, Jonse, Renteria

IX. Presentations:

1. Long Range Financial Plan

Reinet Marneweck, Chief Financial Officer, explained the purpose of the Long Range Financial Plan (the LRFP). The LRFP is a 10-year plan for the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority that forecasts the Authority’s financial resources and projected expenditures based on planned levels of service and the strategic goals of Capital Metro. The presentation focused on the following:

- Benefits of a Long Range Plan Model
- Revenues; Sales Tax History; Recent Sales Tax Trends
- Operating Expenses
- Cost of Connections 2025
- Capital Proposed Plan; Major Capital Projects
- LRFP Model Scenarios: Baseline - FY2018 Budget & Five-Year CIP; Aggressive, Recession, Proposed LRFP
- Proposed Plan Financials
- Unfunded Projects Next 10 Years
- Risks to LRFP
- Conclusions & Recommendations

Throughout the discussion, Board member Kitchen asked for the following:
- A briefing on our plans for electrification of vehicles and plans for autonomous vehicles
- Details on the $54 million cost of the Paratransit facility - costs seem too high.

2. Pickup Pilot Project Status Update
Chad Ballentine, Vice President of Paratransit and Innovative Mobility Operations, presented this item. This is version two of the free on-demand service called Pickup which launched June 2017, operating on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. The popular service reached six-month ridership goals within its first two months of service. As a result, starting this month service began operating Monday to Saturdays. With the addition of MetroRail’s MLK Station to its service zone, we are looking to test Pickup’s effectiveness as a first-mile, last-mile solution.

Throughout the discussion, Board members had questions on ridership and costs of the service so far. They also asked about possible partnerships with existing TNC or rideshare companies.

3. Try Transit Q3 Report

Lonny Stern, Community Involvement, presented the report. Lonny spoke about the outreach methods done to educate people on how to use transit. He also spoke about the various transit adventures and the Smart Trips program.

X. Reports:

1. President’s Report

Linda Watson, President & CEO, presented the report. The President's report included the following:

- Recognition of Yannis Banks, Community Involvement Team
- Summary of our annual ACL service and a thank you to staff

XI. Items for Future Discussion:

XII. Adjournment

ADA Compliance

Reasonable modifications and equal access to communications are provided upon request. Please call (512)389-7458 or email gina.estrada@capmetro.org if you need more information.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Wade Cooper, chair; Juli Word, board secretary; Terry Mitchell, Pio Renteria, Delia Garza, Rita Jonse and Ann Kitchen. Board Liaison: Gina Estrada (512)389-7458, email gina.estrada@capmetro.org if you need more information.

The Board of Directors may go into closed session under the Texas Open Meetings Act. In accordance with Texas Government Code, Section 551.071, consultation with attorney for any legal issues, under Section 551.072 for real property issues; under Section 551.074 for personnel matters, or under Section 551.076, for deliberation regarding the deployment or implementation of security personnel or devices; arising regarding any item listed on this agenda.
I. Presentations:

1. Connections 2025 - Proposed June 2018 Service Changes
   Purpose of today's work session is to review and discuss the various elements related to the proposed June 2018 Service Changes. Discussion included:
   - Benefits
   - Review of proposals by Geographic Area
   - Summary of Public Involvement
   - Recommended Revisions
   - Impacts of Proposed Service Changes

Comments from Board Members included some from Board Member Kitchen, who appreciates all the work staff has done and shared her perspective. She doesn't believe that hard choices necessitates that we leave individuals with no choices. It is not okay with that perspective - felt compelled to share her perspective.

Board Member Garza stated that she appreciates staff’s explanation - but how do you quantify significantly changing someone’s life because we’re increasing frequency and ridership?

Board Member Jonse says that she is excited about PickUp program. This will help some of those people that feel they are being left out due to changes.

2. Revisions to Board Bylaws

Discussion of this item was limited to a brief overview of the changes from Chief Counsel Butcher, who stated that she will bring them through for a full discussion at the November and December board meetings.
II. Items for Future Discussion:

III. Adjournment

ADA Compliance

Reasonable modifications and equal access to communications are provided upon request. Please call (512)389-7458 or email gina.estrada@capmetro.org if you need more information.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Wade Cooper, chairperson; Juli Word, board secretary; Delia Garza, Ann Kitchen, Rita Jonse, Terry Mitchell, and Pio Renteria. Board Liaison: Gina Estrada (512)389-7458, email gina.estrada@capmetro.org if you need more information.

The Board of Directors may go into closed session under the Texas Open Meetings Act. In accordance with Texas Government Code, Section 551.071, consultation with attorney for any legal issues, under Section 551.072 for real property issues; under Section 551.074 for personnel matters, or under Section 551.076, for deliberation regarding the deployment or implementation of security personnel or devices; arising regarding any item listed on this agenda.
Approval of the 2018 Capital Metro Board Meeting Calendar
SUBJECT:
Approval of a resolution by the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors to adopt the 2018 Board Meeting Calendar.

FISCAL IMPACT:
This action has no fiscal impact.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Strategic Goal Alignment:
3. Community

Strategic Objectives:
3.1 Educate and inform stakeholders and the community about Capital Metro’s vision and mission and the value public transit brings to a community.

EXPLANATION OF STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:
Holding regularly scheduled board and committee meetings increases the likelihood of meaningful public input and ensures the timely execution of Agency business.

BUSINESS CASE:
Not applicable.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:
This item will be presented to the full board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Approval of the Capital Metro 2018 Board Meeting Calendar.

DBE/SBE PARTICIPATION: Does not apply.

PROCUREMENT: Does not apply.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Board of Directors
RESOLUTION OF THE CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2017-606)

Approval of the Capital Metro 2018 Board Meeting Calendar

WHEREAS, Section 451.514 of the Texas Transportation Code requires the Board of Directors to hold at least one regular meeting each month to transact the business of the Authority and to set the place, date and time for each meeting.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors will hold a monthly meeting at 12:00 noon at 2910 East Fifth Street, Austin, Texas and adopts the schedule laid out in the attached document for calendar year 2018.

________________________
Date: ____________________

Secretary of the Board
Juli Word
## Capital Metro 2018 Board Calendar - DRAFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F/A/A Committee</th>
<th>O/P/S Committee</th>
<th>Full Board Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 a.m. to noon</td>
<td>12:30 to 2:30</td>
<td>Noon to 3 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Wednesday, 17</td>
<td>Wednesday, 17</td>
<td>Monday, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Wednesday, 14</td>
<td>Wednesday, 14</td>
<td>Monday, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Wednesday, 14</td>
<td>Wednesday, 14</td>
<td>Monday, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Monday, 9</td>
<td>Monday, 9</td>
<td>Monday, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Wednesday, 9</td>
<td>Wednesday 9</td>
<td>Monday, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Wednesday, 13</td>
<td>Wednesday, 13</td>
<td>Monday, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Wednesday, 18</td>
<td>Wednesday, 18</td>
<td>Monday, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Monday, 13</td>
<td>Monday, 13</td>
<td>Monday, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Thursday, 13</td>
<td>Monday, 17</td>
<td>Friday, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Wednesday, 10</td>
<td>Wednesday, 10</td>
<td>Monday, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Friday, 2</td>
<td>Friday, 2</td>
<td>Wednesday, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Wednesday, 5</td>
<td>Wednesday, 5</td>
<td>Monday, 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised 10/24/17
TITLE: Approval of the appointment of Jeffrey Travillion to the Operations, Planning and Safety Committee, and ___________ as Committee Chairperson.
SUBJECT: Approval of the appointment of Jeffrey Travillion to the Operations, Planning and Safety Committee, and ___________ as Committee Chairperson.

FISCAL IMPACT: This action has no fiscal impact.

STRATEGIC PLAN: Strategic Goal Alignment: 3. Community

Strategic Objectives: 3.2 Build Strong Community Partnerships that further Capital Metro’s mission and vision.

EXPLANATION OF STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT: Does not apply.

BUSINESS CASE: Does not apply.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: This agenda item will be presented to the full board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: In accordance with the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors Bylaws the Board desires to formalize the appointment of a member and Chairperson for the Operations, Planning and Safety Committee subject to the concurrence of the members of the board.

DBE/SBE PARTICIPATION: Does not apply.

PROCUREMENT: Does not apply.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Bus and Paratransit Services
RESOLUTION OF THE CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2017-609)
Appointment of Board Committee Chair and Member

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors desires to formalize the appointment of a Chair and member to the Operations, Planning and Safety Committee in accordance with the Board Bylaws; and

WHEREAS, the Board Chair recommends __________ as Chair and Jeffrey Travillion to serve as a member of the Operations, Planning and Safety Committee of the Capital Metro Board of Directors for the remainder of the 2017 Calendar Year.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors hereby approves __________ as Chair and Jeffrey Travillion to serve as a member of the Operations, Planning and Safety Committee of the Capital Metro Board of Directors for the remainder of the 2017 Calendar Year.

________________________            Date: ______________________
Secretary of the Board
Juli Word
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to implement the June 2018 Service Changes.
SUBJECT:
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to implement the June 2018 Service Changes.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding for this action is available in the FY2018 Operating Budget.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Strategic Goal Alignment:

Strategic Objectives:
1.2 Improve system reliability and convenience, 1.3 Ensure an attractive and accessible transit environment, 1.4 Deliver a customer-friendly experience through our people and systems, 2.1 Foster a new regional vision, 3.4 Support plans and programs designed to build ridership and increase market share of alternate transit use. (This requires support from all departments including planning, IT, Ops, and Marketing).

EXPLANATION OF STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:
Service changes are in accordance with Capital Metro’s Service Standards and the adopted Connections 2025 Service Plan. These changes are intended to improve the overall customer experience by creating a more frequent, more reliable and better connected transit system.

BUSINESS CASE:
The June 2018 service changes are the first major phase of implementation for Capital Metro’s Connections 2025 transit system plan. Connections 2025 was a year-long study that reviewed the network, its performance and opportunities. Based on board-established goals, analysis of existing and future conditions, and feedback from Capital Metro riders and key stakeholders, June 2018 service changes are designed to build upon the network’s strengths, maximize ridership, improve the overall rider experience and to ensure the system’s financial sustainability.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:
This agenda item will be presented to the full board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Capital Metro routinely makes changes to improve service or to accommodate shifts in ridership. June 2018 service changes would implement a major part of the board approved Connections 2025 Transit Plan (adopted spring 2017). The goal of these changes is to create a more frequent, more reliable and better connected transit system. The proposed changes are the result of extensive public input received.
(including since the fall of 2015) as part of the development of the Connections 2025 Transit Plan. Edits to the original proposals are also included and are the result of rider and stakeholder input. If approved, the proposed changes would result in a simpler bus system with more frequent, reliable and connected service. Under the plan, fourteen (14) services are proposed to operate as High Frequency Routes (at least every 15 minutes, 7 days a week). In addition, routes have been designed to work as a system with the goal of improving reliability and ease of understanding. Generally, the changes are intended to improve the overall customer experience and help grow ridership.

DBE/SBE PARTICIPATION: Does not apply.

PROCUREMENT: Does not apply.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development
RESOLUTION
OF THE
CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2017-415)
2018 June Service Changes

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management endeavor to implement the first major phase of Connections 2025 (a two year long project designed to create a system that provides cost-effective fixed-route transit services that respond to and build ridership demand while minimizing impacts on current riders); and

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management recognize the need to consider citizen comments and staff recommendations received during several public meetings and at the November 1, 2017 Public Hearings; and

WHEREAS, an equity analysis of these Service Changes, as required under the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Title VI review, found that any disparate impact (minority) or disproportionate burden (low-income) on affected populations had been mitigated in these changes;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors that the President/CEO, or her designee, is authorized to implement June 2018 Service Changes described in the attached document beginning Sunday, June 3, 2018.

________________________
Date: ____________________

Secretary of the Board
Juli Word
To: Kerri Butcher, Chief Counsel  
From: Diponker Mukherjee, Title VI Coordinator  
Date: November 9, 2017  
Subject: Summary of Title VI Equity Analysis for June 2018 Service Changes

As part of the implementation of Connections 2025, Capital Metro is proposing major service changes effective June 2018. The goal of Connections 2025 is to create a more frequent, more reliable, and better connected transit system, and these proposed system-wide service changes would help accomplish that. More than half of the current 82 routes would see some level of changes, with 38 remaining the same. Initially as published on the Capital Metro website, the plan proposed to eliminate 17 current routes, change 22 routes, and add 5 new routes. However, most riders are anticipated to see similar and likely even better services replacing their current experience.

According to Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 4702.1B effective in October 2012, Transit Providers that operate 50 or more fixed route vehicles in peak service and are also located in a UZA of 200,000 or more in population, are required to conduct an equity analysis every time there is a major service change. Capital Metro is one of the large transit agencies in the nation and is above the threshold for a Title VI Equity Analysis. Capital Metro has established policies to define thresholds for a major service change as well as adverse effects caused by a major service change. The following document provides an executive summary of the Title VI Service Equity Analysis that Capital Metro conducted for the proposed June 2018 service changes.
A. EXPLANATIONS OF RELEVANT TERMINOLOGIES

Before we dive into the details, it is necessary to clarify some technical terms, policies, and thresholds that are associated with the Title VI Service Change Equity Analysis. All major service changes will be subject to an equity analysis which includes an analysis of adverse effects on minority and low-income populations.

Major Service Change Policy

Capital Metro considers a service change as a "major service change" if it lasts more than twelve months and qualifies for a public hearing. The June 2018 change is in need of an equity analysis under Title VI. Service changes that require a public hearing are currently defined as:

- The elimination of an existing bus route; or
- The establishment of a new bus route; or
- A substantial geographical alteration on a given route of more than 25% of its route miles; or
- A major modification of a route which causes a 25% or greater change in the number of daily service hours provided by that route.

Adverse Effect

As mentioned in the Title VI Circular 4702.1B, the adverse effect can be measured by the change between the existing and proposed service levels that would be deemed significant. Changes in service that have an adverse effect and that may result in a disparate impact include reductions in service (e.g., elimination of route, shortlining a route, rerouting an existing route, increase in headways). Elimination of a route will generally have a greater adverse impact than a change in headways.
Service additions may also create an adverse effect on minority and low-income populations, especially if they come at the expense of reductions in service on other routes. Moreover, if the benefits of service additions are not distributed equitably, it may also create adverse effects on minority and low-income people. Capital Metro analyzes the degree of adverse effects when planning for any major service changes.

### +/-2 Threshold

Under adopted policies consistent with Title VI, Capital Metro considers an adverse effect on minority or low-income population due to a major service change, when the difference between the average minority or low-income population near the affected route and the average service area minority threshold (33%) or the average service area low-income threshold (18%) is greater than +/- 2.

### Disparate Impact

Disparate Impact refers to an adverse effect absorbed by minority persons that is considered to be significantly disproportionate. The minority population is the protected class by Title VI. The Capital Metro threshold of any major service changes where an impact will be considered disparate on a minority population is +/-2 of 33%, which is the average minority population of the service area. For example, if route X is proposed to be eliminated and it has 36% minority population near the route (minority population of Census Block Groups within a quarter of a mile from either side of the route) then, this route elimination may have a disparate impact on minority populations. On the other hand, if this route X is a proposed new route, this would provide more benefit to the minority population and wouldn’t have any disparate impact.
Disproportionate Burden

Disproportionate Burden refers to an adverse effect absorbed by low-income persons that is considered to be significantly disproportionate. The Capital Metro threshold of any major service change where an impact will be considered disproportionate on the low-income population is +/-2 of 18%, which is the average service area low-income population with incomes that fall below $29,999 for the household income. For example, if the route X (mentioned above) has 22% low-income population near the route (low-income population of Census Block Groups within a quarter of a mile from either side of the route, then, this route elimination may create a disproportionate burden on the low-income population. On the other hand, if this route X is a proposed new route, this would provide more benefit to the low-income population and wouldn’t have any disproportionate burden.

B. DATA SOURCE AND METHODOLOGY

We used the 2010 census data to find minority population (total population minus non-Hispanic white) for this analysis. We used the Block Group (BG) level data as it is the preferred level to count minority population in close proximity to a route. However, the 2010 Census does not include the income data and it is only available through the American Community Survey (ACS). So, we used the latest 2015 ACS data to find low-income population surrounding routes. But, we were not able to use ACS data for minority population because it doesn’t provide the racial breakdown needed for the analysis.

Using the Geographic Information Systems (GIS), we created a ¼ mile buffer on both sides of a route and captured the minority as well as low income population within the buffer area. Then, we identified the routes that didn’t pass the test for Disparate Impact (33%) or Disproportionate Burden (18%). Based on the results of analysis, we identified 35 of 38 routes that were proposed for major service changes that may experience some kind of adverse
effects. All of these potentially adverse effects are on the minority population where the average minority population of those routes are more than 35%. However, we have found no disproportionate burden on low-income populations for all eliminated and modified routes.

We applied the three basic steps “Avoid, Minimize, and Mitigate” to all routes that failed the test for Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden (DIDB). In order to complete the equity analysis, we considered all comments and suggestions gathered through public hearings, meetings, and other sources, and examined and analyzed the following elements before proposing a route for any major changes:

1. Identified minority block groups that are no longer served by the affected route (i.e., negative impact of route change)
2. Identified additional (new) minority block groups that are served by the affected route (i.e., positive impact of route change)
3. Identified mitigation route(s)
4. Identified ½ mile walk shed around eliminated, proposed, and mitigation routes.

C. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Capital Metro asked for public comments and feedback from our community on these proposed significant changes to our transit system network. Throughout the planning process, the public had the opportunity to provide their feedback in a number of ways, including email: feedback@capmetro.org and Twitter: @CapMetroATX. The board of directors also heard public comments in September and October board meetings. In addition, there was a workshop in October that provided opportunities to board members as well as the public to understand the details of this complex proposal for service changes. Capital Metro also provided more opportunities for the public to share input at the following engagement events:
D. SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS

The following summarizes all major service changes that are proposed as part of the June 2018 Service Changes. To simplify this analysis, we put all of these routes into three groups: eliminated routes, modified routes, and new routes. The detailed information by route is provided in tables on pages 16-18.

1. Modified Routes

Currently, there are twenty routes proposed for modification that exceed the major service change threshold. These are 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 17, 18, 20, 37, 228, 271, 300, 311, 323, 325, 333, 392, 490, 491, and 492. Except Routes 5 and 491, changes to the other eighteen routes could result in a disparate impact. However, eight of these routes will experience a frequency increase. Although these changes meet the threshold for review as a major service change in an area with a minority population, these changes will bring positive benefits to minority riders, and will not have an
adverse impact. None of these routes show a disproportionate burden on low-income population. For detailed information, please see Table 1 on page 18 and Map 1 on page 14.

**Service increased** – The following services will experience a positive impact from the service change.

- Routes 2, 4, 10, 17, 18, 20, 311, and 333 will experience a frequency increase to every 15 minutes.

**Service is modified and replaced** - The following modified route segments are replaced or served by one or multiple proposed routes. **Mitigation** highlights are provided below:

- **Route 2** - Stops on Ledesma, Prock, and Sara are proposed to be eliminated. These are within a one-half mile walk from proposed frequent Routes 2 and 300 which is improved service.
- **Route 4** - Frequent Route 17 provides an option for existing service along Vargas.
- **Route 6** - Stops which are proposed to be eliminated on Elanor, Hudson, and Delano are within a quarter-mile of remaining stops.
- **Route 10** –Proposed Route 324 provides service on Georgian, proposed Route 7 provides service along the segment near ACC Highland, and proposed Route 325 provides service along Rundberg.
- **Route 17** –Bolm Road and Shady Lane are within 0.5 mile of proposed Route 4 and existing Route 350, and the rerouted 17. There are four stops along Gardner, Lotus, and Arthur Stiles served by the current Route 17 that are more than a half-mile walk from the proposed Route 4 and existing Route 350. There is an average of 43 weekday boardings at these stops. A proposed school trip on Route 4 would serve approximately 15 of these weekday boardings.
- **Route 18** –Eliminated stop on 21st Street is 0.2 mile to rerouted Route 18.
Route 20 – Route is extended to Austin-Bergstrom International Airport (ABIA). Route 310 provides service on Wickersham and to ACC Riverside.

Route 37 - Renamed to Route 337 and reconfigured to provide east/west service. Proposed Routes 10, 233, and 300 would provide service to eliminated stops.

Route 228 - The proposed Route #228 would deviate from the current Route #228 west of Stassney Lane by shifting service to the north toward downtown instead of continuing west parallel to SH 71. Many existing stops are located within a one-half mile walk of new proposed Routes #310 and #315 and existing frequent Route 7, so bus service would still be accessible.

Route 271 – There are no stops impacted as the route operates along the frontage road for the proposed rerouted section. Customers wishing to travel to ACC Riverside may use proposed Routes 310 and 350.

Route 300 – This route is combined with the eliminated Route 331. Proposed Route 310 provides service along the Ben White portion of the route. Stops on Rogge Lane are within half-mile of proposed frequent local Routes 10 and 20.

Route 323 – Proposed Route 339 provides service on Springdale north of 183, Tuscany Way, Exchange, Forbes, Cross Park, and Centre Creek. Stops along Craigwood are within a third of a mile of Routes 237 and 339 stops on FM 969.

Route 333 - Proposed Route 315 provides service to Oak Hill Shopping Center.

Route 325 – Proposed route extension to Tech Ridge via Metric (replaces current Route 1 service). Proposed Route 324 provides service along Colony Creek, Galewood, Payton Gin, Ohlen and Burnet.

Service is not replaced -

Route 228 - There are 5 bus stops served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route and are more than a one-half mile walk from the
mitigation Routes #310 and #315. These bus stops are located on Burleson Road east of Todd Lane. There is an average of 29 weekday boardings at these 5 bus stops.

2. Eliminated Routes
Currently, there are thirteen routes proposed for elimination. These are 21, 22, 100, 122, 127, 238, 240, 275, 320, 331, 464, 653, and 970. All but two routes show potential disparate impact since they provide services to minority areas. However, none of these routes shows a disproportionate burden on the low-income population. For detailed information, please see Table 2 on page 19 and Map 2 on page 15.

All routes being eliminated are either replaced or served by one or more other new or existing routes. Many of the eliminated routes will now be served by more frequent service than what is proposed for elimination. Mitigation highlights are provided below:

Service is replaced and more frequent -
- Route 100 customers may use frequent local Route 20.
- Route 127 customers may use frequent local Route 7.
- Route 238 is renumbered as Route 338 and frequency increased.
- Route 240 customers may use frequent Routes 325, 801, and 803 and local Routes 1 and 3.
- Route 331 is replaced by Route 228 & frequent local Route 300.
- Route 464 is replaced by frequent local Route 18.
- Route 653 is replaced by frequent local Route 10.

Service is replaced –
- Routes 21/22 are replaced by Routes 17, 18, 20, 322, 335, and 663.
- Route 275 is served by a rerouted local Route 1.
- Route 320 is replaced by new Routes 322 and 337.

No impacts –
- Route 122 does not have any adverse effect because it travels through areas with low minority and low-income populations. Vanpool is an option for these customers.
- Route 970 doesn’t have any adverse impact because it travels through areas with low minority and low-income populations. Vanpool is an option for these customers.

Service is not replaced –
- Route 240 - On the north end of the route, there are five bus stops served by the current route that would no longer be served and are not within a one-half mile walk of the mitigation Routes #325, #801, or #803. It would be approximately a 0.7 mile walk to the proposed Route #325. These stops have a total of 93 average weekday boardings with over two-thirds of the boardings at HEB at Parmer and MoPac. Due to the challenging street network in this area, it would be costly to modify other routes to serve this area.

3. New Routes
Currently, there are seven routes that are proposed for addition. These are 105, 310, 315, 324, 335, 339, and 345. Five of these routes will provide additional services to high minority areas while Routes 335 and 345 will provide services to minority populations that are just below the threshold of 33%. Ultimately, all of these routes will bring significant benefits to minority populations since a very high minority population will have access to these new routes.

Although these routes will travel through minority areas, they may not cover very high low-income areas. So, we may see a lower degree of adverse effect on low-income populations since the
benefits from these additional services may not reach to them proportionately. For detailed information, please see Table 3 on page 20 and Map 3 & 4 on pages 16-17.

E. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

When we considered individual changes, a potential disparate impact on minority populations was found for 11 of 13 routes that are proposed to be eliminated and 18 of 20 routes that are proposed for major service changes based on the policy thresholds for consideration. The potential disparate impacts are mitigated on almost all of the eliminated routes as these routes will be replaced or served by one or multiple new or changed routes. Similarly, most of the modified routes will be replaced or served by one or multiple routes. In fact, eight of those modified routes will have a significant frequency increase that will bring benefits of this service change to minority populations. In addition, there are five new routes that will provide services to significantly high minority population areas.

No disproportionate burden on the low-income population was found for any proposed eliminated and modified routes. When the new proposed routes are analyzed in isolation from the other proposed changes, the analysis identifies a potential for an adverse effect on the low-income population since the proposed new routes will not travel through many low-income areas. So, the benefits of the new routes may not go to low-income population proportionately. However, these new routes will greatly benefit identified minority populations and the increased frequency and other service improvements and modifications of the proposed changes will bring significant improvements in service to areas with high concentrations of low-income individuals.

Throughout the planning process, staff evaluated each change to determine whether any adverse effects would occur on minority or low-income populations. We applied “Avoid, Minimize, and Mitigate” principles to reduce disproportionate impacts. When staff did find a change that would
impact one of these groups, available alternatives were identified including alternate trips and services that could provide comparable service. After considering public comments and other resources, the impact from the final proposed route changes has been reduced compared to the initial proposal. The Table 4 on pages 21-24 will provide information on how we considered public comments in order to finalize the route changes. In the final proposal, there are thirteen routes proposed for elimination instead of 17, 20 routes will see major changes instead of 22, and seven new routes will be added instead of five.

Capital Metro’s responsibility is to guarantee that all transit service, and access to its facilities, are equitably distributed and provided without regard to race, color, or national origin. Capital Metro’s goal is to also ensure equal opportunities to all individuals to participate in all local, sub regional and regional transit planning and decision-making processes. Capital Metro recognizes the importance of ensuring that internal processes, procedures, and policies for conducting any Title VI Equity analyses are clearly defined. Moving forward, we will review, assess, and propose any update or revision needed for our existing policies, procedures, and/or thresholds related to Title VI Equity Analysis to ensure that the census data and procedures include recent demographics of Austin area as permitted by the FTA Circular.

Capital Metro has conducted extensive public outreach regarding these proposed service changes. In the future, we will ensure that the equity analysis is available to the public through our website, social media, and other sources. We can also conduct a survey once the service is implemented to assess how the changes have affected riders.

As outlined in the FTA Circular 4702.1B, transit agencies “can implement major service changes or reductions that would have disproportionately high and adverse impacts provided that the recipient demonstrates that the action meets a substantial need that is in the public interest and that alternatives would have more severe adverse effects than the preferred alternative.”
All of these changes are designed to improve the entire transit system as a whole, including riding experience and operating efficiency. The number of minority and low-income people within the current Capital Metro service area, who will have faster, more reliable access to employment, healthcare, education, social services, and recreation opportunities available through these upcoming service changes, far exceeds the number of people potentially negatively affected by this change. Overall, the proposed service changes will have a positive impact within the system because of the level of investment proposed to increase capacity through additional trips on existing services. Based on this analysis, Capital Metro believes that these proposals do not violate federal mandates.
Figure 1: Modified Routes
Figure 2: Eliminated Routes
Figure 4: New Routes
Table 1: Modified Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Route Total Population</th>
<th>Route Minority Population</th>
<th>Route %Minority</th>
<th>Service Area %Minority</th>
<th>%Minority Result</th>
<th>Minority Impact</th>
<th>Route Poverty Households</th>
<th>Route Total Households</th>
<th>Route %Low Income</th>
<th>Service Area % Low Income</th>
<th>%Low Income Result</th>
<th>Low Income Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33,608</td>
<td>20,927</td>
<td>62.27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>16,411</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-10.02</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,223</td>
<td>32,600</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>23,223</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-8.22</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>105,689</td>
<td>36,509</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>50,167</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-14.66</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32,789</td>
<td>20,132</td>
<td>61.40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>15,960</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-9.71</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>133,114</td>
<td>75,062</td>
<td>56.39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63.93</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>58,702</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-10.72</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30,044</td>
<td>17,999</td>
<td>59.91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>14,196</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-11.43</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>54,381</td>
<td>25,065</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>20,967</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-13.37</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>84,417</td>
<td>51,620</td>
<td>61.15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>37,336</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-9.06</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>77,023</td>
<td>47,639</td>
<td>61.85</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>30,208</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-7.81</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>36,064</td>
<td>26,387</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>14,127</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4.73</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>43,074</td>
<td>34,830</td>
<td>80.86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>15,145</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>113,417</td>
<td>84,047</td>
<td>74.10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6,323</td>
<td>47,909</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>69,096</td>
<td>48,930</td>
<td>70.81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.81</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>27,503</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-5.10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>67,677</td>
<td>51,420</td>
<td>75.98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42.98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,279</td>
<td>27,792</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>59,650</td>
<td>43,691</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,364</td>
<td>24,410</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4.22</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>95,962</td>
<td>51,857</td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>38,942</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-11.33</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>48,863</td>
<td>28,675</td>
<td>58.68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>22,601</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-12.56</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>36,569</td>
<td>25,295</td>
<td>69.17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>17,418</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-10.20</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>25,578</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-13.37</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>13,609</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-16.18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>41,482</td>
<td>27,186</td>
<td>65.54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>17,937</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-5.42</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Eliminated Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Route Total Population</th>
<th>Route Minority Population</th>
<th>Route %Minority</th>
<th>Service Area %Minority</th>
<th>%Minority Result</th>
<th>Minority Impact</th>
<th>Route Poverty Households</th>
<th>Route Total Households</th>
<th>Route %Low Income</th>
<th>Service Area % Low Income</th>
<th>%Low Income Result</th>
<th>Low Income Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>84,454</td>
<td>33,248</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>34,995</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-13.85</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>85,419</td>
<td>33,485</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>35,651</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-13.93</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>70,448</td>
<td>44,933</td>
<td>63.78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.78</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>28,316</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-7.93</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>121,466</td>
<td>36,271</td>
<td>29.86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-3.14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>54,761</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-15.79</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>82,194</td>
<td>50,227</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>31,629</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-9.76</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>43,931</td>
<td>17,546</td>
<td>39.94</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>21,196</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-14.36</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>63,863</td>
<td>44,734</td>
<td>70.05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.05</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>27,006</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-5.99</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>55,255</td>
<td>40,537</td>
<td>73.36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>22,401</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4.93</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>105,976</td>
<td>61,905</td>
<td>58.41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,113</td>
<td>49,491</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-9.69</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>66,922</td>
<td>38,659</td>
<td>57.77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td>31,689</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-8.60</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>23,865</td>
<td>11,713</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-14.90</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>23,281</td>
<td>9,239</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-13.81</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>48,344</td>
<td>13,050</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-6.01</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>25,812</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-16.34</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3: New Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Route Total Population</th>
<th>Route Minority Population</th>
<th>Route %Minority</th>
<th>Service Area %Minority</th>
<th>%Minority Result</th>
<th>Minority Impact</th>
<th>Route Poverty Households</th>
<th>Route Total Households</th>
<th>Route %Low Income</th>
<th>Service Area % Low Income</th>
<th>%Low Income Result</th>
<th>Low Income Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>61,426</td>
<td>23,556</td>
<td>38.35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>26,198</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-14.32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>45,033</td>
<td>32,370</td>
<td>71.88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>20,008</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-6.16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>47,719</td>
<td>19,201</td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>22,601</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-13.67</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>58,445</td>
<td>40,081</td>
<td>68.58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.58</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>24,460</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4.55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>35,510</td>
<td>10,413</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>17,109</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-14.13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>40,272</td>
<td>33,738</td>
<td>83.78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.78</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>15,702</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-6.57</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>10,405</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-15.42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4: Consideration of Public Comments in the Planning process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>Revise</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide direct service to Criss Cole Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reduces duplication on Medical Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Operate in addition to UT Shuttle on Speedway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UT Shuttle available / within quarter-mile of Frequent Route 7 (5 minute walk) and third of a mile of Route 1/MetroRapid 801 (6 minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Serve Greyhound Station</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Within quarter-mile of Frequent Route 7 (5 minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Keep Route 7 on Friedrich to Woodward</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Preserves access to employers and businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maintain service on Vargas (residential street) instead of proposed Montopolis (mixed use street)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Within quarter-mile of Frequent Route 17 (5 minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/22</td>
<td>Do not eliminate Routes 21/22</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All stops within a half-mile of Frequent Routes 4, 17, 18, 20 &amp; 335; Route 322; and UT Shuttle 663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Provide school trips to Small M.S.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Transfers available via Route 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Serve Perez Elementary School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Serves less than 13 boardings per day / Decreasing ridership with no growth potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Preserve service to Met Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Extend Route 271 to serve Met Center / Serves over 50 boardings per day at Met Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Preserve service to Anderson Mill neighborhood, Lakeline Mall, and NLTC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Serves over 180 boardings in Anderson Mill / Lakeline Mall and 375 boardings at NLTC (Cost balanced by uncoupling from Route 392)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Staff initiated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Route reinstated. Service would end at Burnet instead of Great Hills (served by Route 383) / Frequency adjusted to every 40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Continue to operate service at least one day a week</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other service available that operates 7 days per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Serve St. David's Medical Center North</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Serves less than 25 boardings per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Continue to operate on Heatherwilde</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reduces duplication on Howard and preserves current route at no additional cost (Cost balanced by reducing frequency to every 40 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Continue serving ACC Riverside</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operator input / Ability to transfer to multiple routes at ACC Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Preserve Route 300 service on Rogge (residential street) instead of proposed 51st (mixed use street)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Within a half-mile of Frequent Routes 10, 20 &amp; 300 (10 minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Serve Oak Hill Shopping Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Serves major destination with no significant route deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Preserve service on Tuscany Way</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Route 339 Tuscany providing 60 minute service (Cost balanced by removing proposed Route 323 extension to Far West - covered by Route 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Operator Comment</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maintain service between Capital Metro and downtown for operator reliefs (currently provided by Route 17)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Within quarter-mile of Frequent Route 4 located at 7th &amp; Pleasant Valley (5 minute walk) / Proposed Frequent Route 4 stops at 8th and Lavaca (current served by Route 17) and 7th and Colorado (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Routes</td>
<td>Ensure adequate recovery time</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Run time and recovery time will be evaluated as part of the schedule development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Routes</td>
<td>Ensure comfort stops at the end of each route</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Continue to provide at CMTA facilities / work with private entities on case by case basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Executive Summary

The Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Capital Metro) continues to evaluate closely all services throughout the system to ensure maximum efficiency of resources and the riders served. As part of the implementation of Connections 2025, Capital Metro is proposing major service changes effective June 2018.

Capital Metro is cognizant of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 601 that states:

“No persons in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.”

Capital Metro’s responsibility is to guarantee that all transit service, and access to its facilities, are equitably distributed and provided without regard to race, color, or national origin. Capital Metro’s goal is to also ensure equal opportunities to all individuals to participate in all local, subregional and regional transit planning and decision-making processes.

Overall the proposed service changes will have a positive impact within the system because of the level of investment proposed to increase capacity through additional trips on existing services. Capital Metro believes that these proposals do not violate federal mandates. According to the Federal Department of Transportation’s Circular 4702.1B,

“[Agencies] shall evaluate significant system-wide service and fare changes and proposed improvements at the planning and programming stages to determine whether these changes have a discriminatory impact.”

The proposed June 2018 service changes are in accordance with Capital Metro’s Service Standards and represent an incremental step in implementing Connections 2025. Connections 2025 was a plan developed with significant input from the community, riders and members of the Board of Directors for Capital Metro to ensure maximum efficiency of the service provided to the public (in accordance with adopted Capital Metro Service Standards).

The goal of Connections 2025 is to create a more frequent, more reliable and better connected transit system, and the service changes proposed here would help accomplish that. If approved

---

by the Capital Metro board of directors in November, they would affect the whole system. In fact, more than half of the current 82 routes would see some level of change, with 38 remaining the same.

The proposed June 2018 changes would make for a simpler bus system that has more direct routes without many of the current system’s confusing twists and turns through neighborhoods. They would also bring much more frequent service. While the plan proposes to eliminate 13 current routes, most riders would see similar and likely even better service replace their current experience.

The proposed changes have been going through a public engagement period between September and when the board votes on November 15. If approved, the changes would take effect Sunday, June 3, 2018.

This proposal is the result of extensive public input received since the fall of 2015 as part of the development of the Connections 2025 Transit Plan. In addition, we will provide further opportunities both in person and online for the public to learn about these proposed changes.

The proposed changes are added resource investments designed to increase ridership for the system. The general themes of the proposed changes are as follows:

**More Frequent**

- 14 High-Frequency Routes
- Departures at least every 15 minutes
- 7 days a week

**More Reliable**

- More direct routing
- Eliminates route deviations within neighborhoods
- Easier to understand system

**Better Connected**

- Routes designed to work as a system
- Decreased waiting time for your next bus
- Riders able to transfer with more confidence
These changes are intended to improve the overall customer experience and are in accordance with the FY 2018 budget and Connections 2025. The following evaluation focuses on changes where services will be modified and whether impacts may occur as follows:

- Assesses the effects of the proposed changes on minority and low-income populations.
- Assesses the alternatives available for people affected by these changes
- Determines which, if any of the proposals would have a disproportionately high effect on minority and low income riders
- Describes the actions Capital Metro will take to minimize, mitigate or offset any adverse effect of these changes on minority and low income riders

As outlined in the FTA Circular 4702.1B, transit agencies “can implement major service changes or reductions that would have disproportionately high and adverse impacts provided that the recipient demonstrates that the action meets a substantial need that is in the public interest and that alternatives would have more severe adverse effects than the preferred alternative.
II. Proposed Changes by regions

Central Core

The major changes in the central core would focus on replacing Routes 21/22 with improved, more frequent service on similar corridors. That includes changing the routing and increasing frequency on Routes 17 and 18. Service between Lake Austin Blvd. and UT would remain via Route 663. New Route 335 would also be added to the High-Frequency Network and run every 15 minutes, seven days a week. The new Route 322 would take over the 21/22’s routing east of IH-35 between the East Cesar Chavez and Cherrywood neighborhoods. Portions of Exposition formerly served by Routes 21/22 would be served by Frequent Routes 18 and 335.

Downtown Austin

The changes in downtown would focus service on three corridors to simplify routing and keep buses moving through the most congested part of Austin. All MetroRapid, MetroFlyer, MetroExpress and most Local routes would operate north-south in the transit-priority lanes on Guadalupe and Lavaca Streets between Cesar Chavez and 8th St. Routes serving the west side of the Capitol Complex and UT would continue along Guadalupe and Lavaca. Routes serving the east side of the Capitol would operate east-west on 7th and 8th Streets and north-south along Trinity and San Jacinto. There would no longer be service on Congress Ave., Red River St., parts of 11th and 12th Streets, and parts of 4th and 5th Streets east of Lavaca. Frequent Route 17 would be realigned to operate on Cesar Chavez and serve Seaholm. Route 100 would be eliminated and its service taken over by Frequent Route 20.

Northeast Austin

The most significant changes include increasing frequency on Route 37 to every 15 minutes during peak hours; converting it to a crosstown route serving schools and employment centers along Loyola Ln., Cameron Rd., Airport Blvd. and Koenig Ln.; and renumbering it to Route 337. Other changes include promoting Routes 18 and 20 to the High-Frequency Network, bringing Route 233 into Colony Park and replacing portions of Route 323 with Route 237. Frequent Route 300 would continue to operate on Springdale Rd. but would transition from Rogge Ln. and Berkman Dr. to 51st St. and Cameron. Some roads currently served by Route 323 would be served by the proposed Route 339, including Springdale north of 183, Tuscany Way, Exchange Dr., Forbes Dr., Cross Park Dr. and Centre Creek Dr.
Central East Austin

The major changes in Central East Austin would be adding Routes 2, 4, 17, 18 and 20 to the High-Frequency Network, greatly improving east-west transit service. While Route 100 would go away and the 350 would no longer serve the airport, Frequent Route 20 would extend to ABIA. Route 271 would now serve FM 973 instead of frontage roads of toll road 130 and continue to serve Grove Blvd. Route 228 serving the Met Center and VA Clinic would begin at Pleasant Valley and Riverside Dr. instead of the South Congress Transit Center. Some portions of Ledesma Rd., Lott Ave., Prock Ln. and Sara Dr. (Route 2); Vargas Rd. (Route 4); and Burleson Rd., Todd Lane and St. Elmo Rd. (Route 228) would lose service.

Southeast Austin

Routes 20, 311 and 333 would see frequency improvements as part of the High-Frequency Network, providing 15-minute service, seven days a week. New Route 338 would connect Southeast Austin to Westgate Shopping Center via Slaughter Ln. and West Gate Blvd., and new Route 310 would provide connections between South Congress Transit Center and ACC Riverside. Route 228 service to the VA Clinic would connect to routes at Pleasant Valley and Riverside instead of the South Congress Transit Center. Route 331 would be combined with Frequent Route 300. Route 127 would be eliminated, with replacement service available on Frequent Route 7. Some portions of Peppertree Pkwy. and Freihrich Ln. (Route 7); Burleson Rd., Todd Ln. and St. Elmo Rd. (Route 228); as well as South Pleasant Valley and Onion Crossing (Route 333) would lose service.

Southwest Austin

Frequency would improve with Routes 10 and 333 joining the High-Frequency Network. New Route 105, traveling from UT to Westgate Shopping Center during the morning and evening rush hours, would replace the southern part of the current Route 5’s service. The ACC Pinnacle campus would be served every 30 minutes by alternating trips on Route 333, as well as by new Route 315, which would travel along Ben White between the South Congress Transit Center and the Pinnacle campus. Route 30 would end at Westgate Shopping Center rather than the South Congress Transit Center. Route 110 would be eliminated, with replacement service available on Frequent Route 10. Route 970 would also be eliminated.
Central North Austin

Among the big changes in Central North Austin are rerouting portions of Routes 7 and 10 and introducing new east-west service. Route 10 would join the High-Frequency Network, operating between the Norwood Walmart, the Mueller neighborhood and UT via Cameron Rd., Mueller Blvd., 45th St. and Red River St. before heading downtown. Route 5 would run on Burnet Rd. and Lamar Blvd. to downtown, rather than traveling through UT. The new Route 345 would provide east-west service on 45th St. between Hancock Center and Burnet, and Frequent Route 7 would begin at Crestview Station rather than the Norwood Walmart. Service provided by the current Route 320 between Cameron and MoPac would be replaced by Route 337 (the renamed Route 37). Current Route 37 riders could access UT and downtown via Frequent Routes 10 and 20.

North Austin

The changes in North Austin would include Route 392 traveling between Tech Ridge and Braker/Burnet. The Great Hills area would be served by Route 383. Frequent Route 325 would operate from Tech Ridge to Metric Blvd. before traveling east-west on Rundberg Lane and ending at the Norwood Walmart. Route 1 would take over the current Route 275, staying on Lamar to the Tech Ridge Park & Ride instead of running on Rundberg and Metric. The new Route 324 would replace portions of the redirected Routes 10 and 325. Some parts of Rutland Dr., Gracy Farms Ln. and Cedar Bend Dr. on Route 240 would lose service.

UT Shuttles

There are very few changes to the UT Shuttle service. The primary change would be replacing Route 653 with Frequent Route 10, which would also provide a frequent connection between UT and the Mueller neighborhood. Changes to UT Shuttle service may include minor frequency changes as we match service to ridership levels.
III. Public Involvement

Capital Metro asked for public comments and feedback from our community on these proposed significant changes to our transit system network. Throughout the planning process, the public had the opportunity to provide their feedback in a number of ways, including email: feedback@capmetro.org and Twitter: @CapMetroATX. The board of directors also heard public comments in September and October board meetings. In addition, there was a workshop in October that provided opportunities to board members as well as the public to understand the details of this complex proposal for service changes. Capital Metro also provided more opportunities for the public to share input at the following engagement events:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Time</th>
<th>Event type</th>
<th>Event &amp; Location</th>
<th>Served by routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Sept. 25, 5:30-7 p.m.</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
<td>Howson Branch Library</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Sept. 26, 5:30-7 p.m.</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
<td>Pleasant Hill Branch Library</td>
<td>1, 201, 333, 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Sept. 27, 5:30-7 p.m.</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
<td>Hampton Branch Library</td>
<td>111, 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, Sept. 28, Noon.</td>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Oct. 2, 5:30-7 p.m.</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
<td>Gus Garcia Recreation Center</td>
<td>10, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Oct. 2, Noon.</td>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Nov. 1, Noon - 12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Public hearing</td>
<td>2910 E. 5th St.</td>
<td>17, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Nov. 1, 5:30 p.m. - 6 p.m.</td>
<td>Public hearing</td>
<td>2910 E. 5th St.</td>
<td>17, 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Definitions and Methodology

Before we dive into the details, it is necessary to clarify some technical terms, policies, and thresholds that are associated with the Title VI Service Change Equity Analysis. All major service changes will be subject to an equity analysis which includes an analysis of adverse effects on minority and low-income populations.

Minority Populations

Minority populations were considered according to the FTA circular guidelines and follow Capital Metro’s approved 2015 Title VI reporting methodology. Groups represented by this definition include:

- Black or African American
- American Indian and Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
- Some other race
- Two or more Races
- Hispanic or Latino (of any race)

Low-Income Populations

Low-income persons were considered according to the FTA circular guidelines but are refined to reflect Capital Metro’s most recent reporting to the FTA. Thus, we have identified household incomes less than $29,999* as low-income. The threshold for this is set at 18% which is the reported percentage of Low-Income households for Travis County (of which over 95% of Capital Metro’s Service Area encompasses).

*According to the Federal Transit Administration, low income is defined as, a person whose median household income is at or below the Department of Health and Human Services’ poverty guidelines. Capital Metro's Planning has referenced poverty as 125% of the federal definition of poverty for a family of four. The poverty level for a family of four is $21,200 and if a 125% measure is applied, it would equate to a threshold of $26,500. However because Census Information is collected and reported in $10,000 increments, low income households are referenced when reporting less than $29,999.
Major Service Change Policy

Capital Metro considers a service change as a "major service change" if it lasts more than twelve months and qualifies for a public hearing. The June 2018 change is in need of an equity analysis under Title VI. Service changes that require a public hearing are currently defined as:

- The elimination of an existing bus route; or
- The establishment of a new bus route; or
- A substantial geographical alteration on a given route of more than 25% of its route miles; or
- A major modification of a route which causes a 25% or greater change in the number of daily service hours provided by that route.

Adverse Effect

As mentioned in the Title VI Circular 4702.1B, the adverse effect can be measured by the change between the existing and proposed service levels that would be deemed significant. Changes in service that have an adverse effect and that may result in a disparate impact include reductions in service (e.g., elimination of route, shortlining a route, rerouting an existing route, increase in headways). Elimination of a route will generally have a greater adverse impact than a change in headways.

Service additions may also create an adverse effect on minority and low-income populations, especially if they come at the expense of reductions in service on other routes. Moreover, if the benefits of service additions are not distributed equitably, it may also create adverse effects on minority and low-income people. Capital Metro analyzes the degree of adverse effects when planning for any major service changes.

+/-2 Threshold

Under adopted policies consistent with Title VI, Capital Metro considers an adverse effect on minority or low-income population due to a major service change, when the difference between the average
minority or low-income population near the affected route and the average service area minority threshold (33%) or the average service area low-income threshold (18%) is greater than +/- 2.

Disparate Impact

Disparate Impact refers to an adverse effect absorbed by minority persons that is considered to be significantly disproportionate. The minority population is the protected class by Title VI. The Capital Metro threshold of any major service changes where an impact will be considered disparate on a minority population is +/-2 of 33%, which is the average minority population of the service area. For example, if route X is proposed to be eliminated and it has 36% minority population near the route (minority population of Census Block Groups within a quarter of a mile from either side of the route) then, this route elimination may have a disparate impact on minority populations. On the other hand, if this route X is a proposed new route, this would provide more benefit to the minority population and wouldn’t have any disparate impact.

Disproportionate Burden

Disproportionate Burden refers to an adverse effect absorbed by low-income persons that is considered to be significantly disproportionate. The Capital Metro threshold of any major service change where an impact will be considered disproportionate on the low-income population is +/-2 of 18%, which is the average service area low-income population with incomes that fall below $29,999 for the household income. For example, if the route X (mentioned above) has 22% low-income population near the route (low-income population of Census Block Groups within a quarter of a mile from either side of the route, then, this route elimination may create a disproportionate burden on the low-income population. On the other hand, if this route X is a proposed new route, this would provide more benefit to the low-income population and wouldn’t have any disproportionate burden.
Data Source

We used the 2010 census data to find minority population (total population minus non-Hispanic white) for this analysis. We used the Block Group (BG) level data as it is the preferred level to count minority population in close proximity to a route. However, the 2010 Census does not include the income data and it is only available through the American Community Survey (ACS). So, we used the latest 2015 ACS data to find low-income population surrounding routes. But, we were not able to use ACS data for minority population because it doesn’t provide the racial breakdown needed for the analysis.

Using the Geographic Information Systems (GIS), we created a ¼ mile buffer on both sides of a route and captured the minority as well as low income population within the buffer area. Then, we identified the routes that didn’t pass the test for Disparate Impact (33%) or Disproportionate Burden (18%). Based on the results of analysis, we identified 35 of 40 routes that were proposed for major service changes that may experience some kind of adverse effects. All of these potentially adverse effects are on the minority population where the average minority population of those routes are more than 35%. However, we have found no disproportionate burden on low-income populations for all eliminated and modified routes.

We applied the three basic steps “Avoid, Minimize, and Mitigate” to all routes that failed the test for Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden (DIDB). In order to complete the equity analysis, we considered all comments and suggestions gathered through public hearings, meetings, and other sources, and examined and analyzed the following elements before proposing a route for any major changes:

1. Identified minority block groups that are no longer served by the affected route
   (i.e., negative impact of route change)
2. Identified additional (new) minority block groups that are served by the affected route
   (i.e., positive impact of route change)
3. Identified mitigation route(s)
4. Identified ½ mile walk shed around eliminated, proposed, and mitigation routes.
V. Data Analysis Results

The following discusses the results of the Title VI Equity Analysis on the proposed Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Capital Metro) bus service changes associated with the Connections 2025 transit plan to be implemented in June 2018.

The proposed June 2018 service changes will implement most of the High-Frequency Network from the approved Connections 2025 transit plan. These changes will result in a large overhaul of Capital Metro’s bus network, with only 38 of 82 routes remaining unchanged. In addition, thirteen routes are proposed to be eliminated.

Table 1 provides the results of the equity analysis for the current bus routes with a greater than 25% change in geographic coverage or service characteristics that constitutes a major service change, the definition of which is required by FTA, and defined by Capital Metro; Table 2 provides the results for current bus routes that are planned for elimination; and, Table 3 provides results for new proposed bus routes planned for implementation in June 2018. In addition to the tabular results of the equity analysis, maps of each of the potential equity routes have been included in this memo that show the subject potential equity routes that require further mitigation analysis, followed by a discussion of mitigation is below each map, where necessary.

Each of the tables contain 13 columns providing various route and demographic data necessary to determine if the subject routes are potential equity routes. All population and race data is from the 2010 U.S. Census, while the low-income/poverty data is from the 2015 American Community Survey. The specific table headings are defined below:

- **Route Number** – These are the specific bus route numbers established by Capital Metro and included on all Capital Metro maps and schedules.
- **Route BGs Total Population** – This is the total population of all block groups located within a one-quarter mile buffer on either side of each subject bus route alignment.
- **Route BGs Minority Population** – This is a calculation subtracting the total non-Hispanic White population for all of the block groups from “Route BGs Total Population”.
- **Route BGs % Minority** – This is a calculation dividing “Route BGs Minority Population” by “Route BGs Total Population”.
- **Service Area Percent Minority** – This is used by Capital Metro as the baseline percentage to determine disparate impacts.
- **Route % Minority Minus Service Area % Minority** – This is a calculation subtracting the route percent minority from the service area percent minority to determine the delta.
If this is a positive number and is greater than two percent (i.e., the disparate impact threshold established in the Capital Metro policies) then a disparate impact has been identified.

- **Potential Minority Impact** – This is a “yes” or “no” answer based on if the “greater than two percent threshold” was reached; routes marked “yes” means those routes have been identified as potential equity routes.

- **Route BGs Poverty Households** – This is the total number of households within the poverty threshold established in the Capital Metro disproportionate impacts policy (125 percent of the Department of Health and Human Services 2015 poverty threshold) for all of the block groups located within a one-quarter mile buffer on either side of each subject bus route alignment.

- **Route BGs Total Households** – This is the total number of households for all of the block groups located within a one-quarter mile buffer on either side of each subject bus route alignment.

- **Route BGs % Low Income** – This is a simple calculation dividing the number of “Route BGs Poverty Households” by the number of “Route BGs Total Households”.

- **Service Area Percent Low Income** – This is the overall percentage of low-income households located within the Capital Metro Service Area and is used as the baseline percentage to determine disproportionate impacts.

- **Route % Low Income Minus Service Area % Income** – This is a calculation subtracting the route percent low-income from the service area percent low-income to determine the difference. If this is a positive number and is greater than two percent (the disproportionate impact threshold established in the Capital Metro policies) then a disproportionate impact has been identified.

- **Potential Low-Income Impact** – This is a “yes” or “no” answer based on if the “greater than two percent” threshold was reached; routes marked “yes” means those routes have been identified as potential equity routes.

The subject equity analysis conforms to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Revised Title VI Circular 4702.1B as well as Capital Metro’s Title VI Disparate and Disproportionate Impact Policies.
Table 1 below shows the results for the specific bus routes that are planned for major changes as part of the implementation of the Connections 2025 service changes.

Table 1: Equity Analysis Results of Current Bus Routes Proposed for Major Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Route Total Population</th>
<th>Route Minority Population</th>
<th>Route % Minority</th>
<th>Service Area % Minority</th>
<th>Route % Minority Impact</th>
<th>Route Poverty Households</th>
<th>Route Total Households</th>
<th>Route % Low Income</th>
<th>Service Area % Low Income</th>
<th>Potential Low Income Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33,608</td>
<td>20,927</td>
<td>62.27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>16,411</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,223</td>
<td>32,600</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>23,223</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>105,689</td>
<td>36,509</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>50,167</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32,789</td>
<td>20,132</td>
<td>61.40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>15,960</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>133,114</td>
<td>75,062</td>
<td>56.39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.39</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>58,702</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30,044</td>
<td>17,999</td>
<td>59.91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>14,196</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>54,381</td>
<td>25,065</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>20,967</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>84,417</td>
<td>51,620</td>
<td>61.15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>37,336</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>77,023</td>
<td>47,639</td>
<td>61.85</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>30,208</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>36,064</td>
<td>26,387</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>14,127</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>43,074</td>
<td>34,830</td>
<td>80.86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>15,145</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>113,417</td>
<td>84,047</td>
<td>74.10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6,323</td>
<td>47,909</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>69,096</td>
<td>48,930</td>
<td>70.81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.81</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>27,503</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>67,677</td>
<td>51,420</td>
<td>75.98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42.98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,279</td>
<td>27,792</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>59,650</td>
<td>43,691</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,364</td>
<td>24,410</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>95,962</td>
<td>51,857</td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>38,942</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>48,863</td>
<td>28,675</td>
<td>58.68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>22,601</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>40,933</td>
<td>26,494</td>
<td>64.73</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>20,007</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>25,578</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-32.80</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>13,609</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>41,482</td>
<td>27,186</td>
<td>65.54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>17,937</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HNTB, October 2017.
As shown in Table 1, there are 20 bus routes in the Connections 2025 service change plan that meet the “greater than 25 percent” change in geographic coverage or service characteristics threshold, meaning an equity analysis is required for all of those routes to determine potential disparate or disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations. Looking at the results presented in Table 1, of those 20 routes, 18 of the routes (those with red highlighted text) are considered “potential equity routes” meaning that the routes exceeded the “greater than two percent” threshold established in Capital Metro’s disparate and disproportionate impacts policies. All 18 of the potential equity routes are considered such because of potential impacts to minorities as there are no low-income impacts that exceed the two percent threshold. For each of these potential equity routes specific mitigation is available, most commonly in the form of continued transit access from the proposed route and/or transit access from other existing or proposed bus routes within a one-half mile walk shed of the current bus route. Maps of each of the potential equity routes listed in Table 1 are provided below and are followed by a mitigation discussion for each.
As shown in **Figure 1**, the proposed Route 2 would deviate from the current Route 2 on the east and west ends of the route. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are 10 bus stops served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route that are located within a minority block group. These stops are located on Ledesma Road, Lott Ave, Prock Lane, and Sara Drive. However, these eliminated stops are all located within a one-half
mile walk of the proposed Route 2 and the proposed Route 300, so frequent \(^3\) bus transit service would be maintained to these areas, with both proposed Routes 2 and 300 serving as a viable mitigation route for these 10 eliminated stops. Additionally, frequency on the Route 2 would be increased from 20-30 minutes to 15 minutes, resulting in better access from a service characteristics standpoint on this proposed route.

**Figure 2: Capital Metro Bus Route 4**

---

\(^3\) Frequent or high-frequency service is service that operates at least every 15 minutes from 6:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and every 15 minutes from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. on weekends.
As shown in Figure 2, the proposed Route 4 would deviate from the current Route 4 predominantly by being truncated on both the east and west ends of the route, specifically along Vargas Road on the east and ending just before MoPac on the west. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are ten minority block groups served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route – nine of these minority block groups are located on the east end of the route and one is located on the west end. However, all ten minority block groups would be served by proposed frequent Route 17, with all of these minority block groups located within a one-half mile walk of the proposed frequent Route 17, so bus transit service would be maintained to these areas. Additionally, frequency on the Route 4 would be increased from 30 minutes to 15 minutes, resulting in better access from a service characteristics standpoint on this proposed route.
As shown in Figure 3, the proposed Route 6 would follow the same alignment as the current Route 6, with only minor deviations on the west end of the route in Downtown Austin and on the east end of the route. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are three stops located in a minority block groups on the east end of the route at Eleanor, Hudson, and Delano Streets that are served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, these three stops would still be served by proposed Route 6 as all three stops are located within approximately one-quarter mile of the closest proposed Route 6 stops. Additionally, frequency on the Route 6 would be increased from every 40 to every 30
minutes resulting in better access from a service characteristics standpoint on this proposed route.

**Figure 4: Capital Metro Bus Route 10**

As shown in Figure 4, the proposed Route 10 would follow the current Route 10 alignment on the southern half of the route but would deviate from the current route on the northern half by shifting service to the east side of IH-35 from the west side of IH-35. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are 22 minority block groups that are served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, 16 of the 20
block groups would be served directly by the proposed new service Route 324 on Georgian Drive and the remaining four minority block groups located at the far northeast end of the route would be served by proposed frequent Route 325. Moreover, 15 additional minority block groups would be accessed by the proposed Route 10 on the east side of IH-35 that are not served by the current Route 10. Additionally, service frequency would increase from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes along proposed Route 10, resulting in better access from a service characteristics standpoint on this proposed route.

Figure 5: Capital Metro Bus Route 17
As shown in Figure 5, the proposed Route 17 would deviate from the current Route 17 by shifting service further south on the east and west ends of the route. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are five minority block groups that are served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, these block groups are located within a one-half mile walk of proposed Route 4 and existing Route 350, so bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups. Additionally, service frequency would increase from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes along proposed Route 4, resulting in better access from a service characteristics standpoint on this proposed route.

In addition to the two minority block groups discussed above, there are four bus stops along Gardner, Lotus, and Arthur Stiles served by the current route on the east end of the alignment that would no longer be served by the proposed route that are located within a minority block group. While the proposed Route 17 would still serve this block group, these four existing bus stops that would be eliminated are located more than a one-half mile walk from the proposed Route 17 and the existing Route 350. There is an average of 43 weekday boardings at these stops. A proposed school trip to Eastside Memorial College Prep H.S. on Route 4 would serve approximately 15 of these weekday boardings.
As shown in Figure 6, the proposed Route 18 would follow the same alignment as the current Route 18, with only minor deviations to the route through Downtown Austin. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there is one stop located in a minority block group on 21st Street that is served by the current route but would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, this stop is located within approximately 0.2 mile of proposed rerouted Route 18. Additionally, frequency on Route 18 would be increased from every 30 minutes to every 15
minutes resulting in better access from a service characteristics standpoint on this proposed route.

Figure 7: Capital Metro Bus Route 20

As shown in Figure 7, the proposed Route 20 would deviate from the current Route 20 in few areas along the route, including discontinuation of service on Grove Boulevard, South Pleasant Valley Road, Wickersham Drive, and Trinity Street/San Jacinto Boulevard. The proposed Route 20 would also be extended and provide direct service to Austin Bergstrom International Airport.
ABIA). In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are five minority block groups (two immediately south of East Oltorf Street and three in East Austin immediately east of IH-35 and immediately adjacent to downtown Austin) that are served by the current route but would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, the two minority block groups south of East Oltorf Street would be served by Route 310 which follows the same route as the current Route 20 in this area and the three block groups in East Austin are located within a one-half mile from the proposed Route 10 and would be served by this route. Moreover, proposed Route 20 provides benefits to additional minority block groups not served by the current Route 20 as the proposed route would provide access to four minority block groups located on the southeast end of the route near ABIA that are not served by the current Route 20. Additionally, service frequency would increase from every 20 minutes to every 15 minutes along proposed Route 20, resulting in better access from a service characteristics standpoint on this proposed route.
As shown in Figure 8, the current Route 37 would be renamed to Route 337 and the proposed Route 337 would be reconfigured to provide east/west service with a discontinuation of service along the southern leg of current Route 37 south of Clayton Lane/Briarcliff Boulevard. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are 11 minority block groups (one in the northeast segment of the current alignment and 10 along the discontinued southern leg) that are served by the current route but would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, all of these minority block groups are within a one-half mile walk of proposed frequent Routes 10
and 300 and local Route 233. Therefore, these block groups would continue to be served by bus transit service after implementation of the proposed Route 337. Additionally, proposed Route 337 would benefit eight new minority block groups located on the northwest end of the route that are not served by the current Route 37.

**Figure 9: Capital Metro Bus Route 228**

As shown in Figure 9, the proposed Route 228 would deviate from the current Route 228 west of Stassney Lane by shifting service to the north towards downtown instead of continuing west parallel to SH 71 to South Congress Transit Center. In terms of potential impacts to minority
populations as a result of this shift, there are nine minority block groups that are served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, these block groups are located within a one-half mile walk of new proposed Routes 310 and 315 and existing frequent Route 7, so bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups. Additionally, there are five bus stops served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route that are located in minority block groups and are more than a one-half mile walk from the mitigation Routes 310 and 315 and existing frequent Route 7. These bus stops are located on Burleson Rd, east of Todd Lane. There is an average of 29 weekday boardings at these 5 bus stops. There would be positive impacts to minority block groups as a result of the implementation of proposed Route 228 as seven additional minority block groups would gain service from the proposed route.
As shown in Figure 10, the proposed Route 271 would deviate from the current Route 271 on both the east and west ends of the route, specifically with Route 271 no longer serving the ACC Riverside campus on the west end of the route. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there is one minority block group served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route as a result of the discontinuation of service to ACC Riverside via proposed Route 271. However, ACC Riverside and the minority block group in which it is contained would be served by the proposed Routes 310 and 350, so bus service would be maintained to the campus and the minority block group. Additionally, the current Route 271 does not stop east of Cheviot as the route travels along the SH-71 and SH-130.
frontage roads; so, while there appears to be an area along these two highway facilities that is served by the current route and not by the proposed route, there are no stops along this segment of the route, so there are no stops lost with the route shift in this area.

Figure 11: Capital Metro Bus Route 300

As shown in Figure 11, the proposed Route 300 would deviate from the current Route 300 predominantly on the north and south ends of the alignment. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations as a result of this deviation, there are 17 minority block groups that are
served by the current route that would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, these block groups are all located within a one-half mile walk of proposed Routes 1, 10 and 20 and new proposed Route 310, so frequent bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups. Additionally, service frequency would increase from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes on proposed Routes 10 and from every 20 minutes to every 15 minutes on proposed 20, resulting in an increase in transit access from a service characteristics standpoint along these routes. The proposed Route 300 would also benefit seven new minority block groups on the southwest end of the proposed route that are not served by the current Route 300.
As shown in Figure 12, the proposed Route 311 would follow the same route as the current Route 311, with the only difference being the addition of four new bus stops on the west end of the route. The major change associated with proposed Route 311 is an increase in frequency from every 35 minutes to every 15 minutes. Therefore, the proposed route change would only
result in positive impacts to minority populations along the route due to the increased service frequency.

**Figure 13: Capital Metro Bus Route 323**

As shown in Figure 13, the proposed Route 323 would follow the same route as the current Route 323 on the northwest end of the route but would be truncated at Rutherford Lane just east of IH-35 with service being discontinued east of this point. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are 17 minority block groups along the discontinued eastern portion of the current Route 323 alignment that would no longer be served by the proposed
route. However, all the existing stops in these minority block groups will be served by the proposed Route 339.

**Figure 14: Capital Metro Bus Route 325**

As shown in Figure 14, the proposed Route 325 would follow the same route as the current Route 325 on the southeast end of the route but would then deviate at West Rundberg Lane and North Gate Boulevard and instead of turning south on North Gate Boulevard, the proposed Route 325 would continue west and then turn north on Metric Boulevard and continue north to
Howard Lane Boulevard ending at Tech Ridge Park and Ride. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are five minority block groups along the discontinued southwestern portion of the current Route 325 alignment that would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, all of these minority block groups would be served by the new proposed Route 324, which would follow the discontinued southwestern leg of the current Route 325 and serve the same population. Therefore, these block groups would continue to be served by bus service after implementation of proposed Route 325. Moreover, 15 additional minority block groups would be served by the proposed Route 325 along the northern leg of the proposed route which are not served by the current route.

Figure 15: Capital Metro Bus Route 333

![Route 333 Map](image-url)

* CapMetro current service area minority and low income make up: 33% of the area is minority 18% of households are defined as low income A Low-Income household is a household that reported income in the 2010 census at or below 125% of 2015 DHHS poverty threshold.
As shown in Figure 15, the proposed Route 333 would follow the current Route 333 alignment for a majority of the route with routing differences on the west end of the routes. While the current Route 333 continues up SH-71 past Oak Hill Shopping Center and beyond, the proposed Route 333 would continue along Convict Hill Road to ACC Pinnacle. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there is one minority block group and the Oak Hill Shopping Center that is served by the current route on the far west end of the route that would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, proposed Route 315 would serve as a mitigation route and provide access to Oak Hill Shopping Center and a portion of the subject minority block group. There is one stop at Travis Count Precinct 3 offices that would no longer have service and would be more than a half-mile walk from Oak Hill Shopping Center. There is an average of 2 weekday boardings at this bus stop. Additionally, service frequency along a majority of the route would increase from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes along proposed Route 333, resulting in better access from a service characteristics standpoint on this proposed route.
As shown in Figure 16, the proposed Route 392 would follow the current Route 392 alignment for a majority of the route with the major routing difference being a truncation of the route west of West Braker Lane and Burnet Road. In terms of potential impacts to minority populations, there are two minority block groups that are served by the current route on the far west end of the route that would no longer be served by the proposed route. However, Route 383 would serve as a mitigation route and provide access to these block groups as Route 383 follows the same route as the current Route 392 in this area.
As shown in Figure 17, proposed Route 490 would follow the same route as the current Route 490 with the change being a reduction of service from four days a week to one day a week. There would be no potential impacts to minority populations as a result of implementation of the proposed Route 490 as all of the same minority block groups would be served by the proposed route as are served by the current route. Despite a reduction in service levels, service
frequency would be maintained due to mitigation Routes 17 and 322 providing service to the minority block groups.

As shown in Figure 18, proposed Route 492 would follow the same route as the current Route 492 with the change being a reduction of service from three days a week to one day a week. There would be no potential impacts to minority block groups as a result of implementation of
the proposed Route 492 as all of the same minority block groups would be served by the proposed route as are served by the current route. Despite a reduction in service levels, service frequency would be maintained due to mitigation Routes 10 and 300 providing frequent service to the minority block groups.
Table 2 below shows the results for the specific bus routes that are planned for elimination as part of the implementation of the Connections 2025 service changes.

Table 2: Equity Analysis Results of Current Bus Routes Proposed for Elimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Route BGs Total Population</th>
<th>Route BGs Minority Population</th>
<th>Route BGs % Minority</th>
<th>Service Area % Minority</th>
<th>Route % Minority Minus Service Area % Minority</th>
<th>Potential Minority Impact</th>
<th>Route BGs Poverty Household</th>
<th>Route BGs Total Household</th>
<th>Route BGs % Low Income</th>
<th>Service Area % Low Income</th>
<th>Route % Low Income Minus Service Area % Income</th>
<th>Potential Low Income Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>84,454</td>
<td>33,248</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>34,995</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-13.85</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>85,419</td>
<td>33,485</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>35,651</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-13.93</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>70,448</td>
<td>44,933</td>
<td>63.78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.78</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>28,316</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-7.93</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>121,466</td>
<td>36,271</td>
<td>29.86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-3.14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>54,761</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-15.79</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>82,194</td>
<td>50,227</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>31,629</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-9.76</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>43,931</td>
<td>17,546</td>
<td>39.94</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>21,196</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-14.36</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>63,863</td>
<td>44,734</td>
<td>70.05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.05</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>27,006</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-5.99</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>55,255</td>
<td>40,537</td>
<td>73.36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>22,401</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4.93</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>105,976</td>
<td>61,905</td>
<td>58.41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,113</td>
<td>49,491</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-9.69</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>66,922</td>
<td>38,659</td>
<td>57.77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td>31,689</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-8.60</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>23,865</td>
<td>11,713</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-14.90</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>23,281</td>
<td>9,239</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-13.81</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>48,344</td>
<td>13,050</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-6.01</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>25,812</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-16.34</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HNTB, October 2017.
As shown in Table 2, there are 13 bus routes planned for elimination in the Connections 2025 transit plan, meaning an equity analysis is required for these routes to determine potential disparate or disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations. Looking at the results presented in Table 2, of those 13 routes, 11 of the routes (those with red highlighted text) are considered “potential equity routes” meaning that the routes exceeded the “greater than two percent” threshold established in Capital Metro’s disparate and disproportionate impacts policies. All 11 of the potential equity routes are considered such because of potential impacts to minorities as there are no low-income impacts that exceed the two percent threshold. For each of these potential equity routes, specific mitigation is available, most commonly in the form of transit access from other existing or proposed bus routes within a one-half mile walk shed of the current bus route. Maps of each of the potential equity routes listed in Table 2 are provided below and are followed by a mitigation discussion for each.
As shown in Figure 19, Route 21 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 21 currently provides service to 30 minority block groups. However, all 30 of these block groups are all located within a one-half mile walk or less of proposed Routes 17, 18, 20, 322 and 335 and existing Routes 1 and 663, so frequent bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups. Additionally, service frequency would increase from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes along proposed Routes 18 and from every 20 minutes to every 15 minutes on proposed Route 8.2.c.
Finally, proposed Route 335 would be a new service route resulting in all three of these proposed routes providing better access from a service characteristics standpoint in this area.

**Figure 20: Capital Metro Bus Route 22 (Planned for Elimination)**

As shown in **Figure 20**, Route 22 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 22 currently provides service to 30 minority block groups. However, all 30 of these block groups are all located within a one-half mile walk or less of proposed Routes 17, 18, 20, 322, and 335 and existing Routes 1 and 663, so frequent bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups.
Additionally, service frequency would increase from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes along proposed Routes 18 and from every 20 minutes to every 15 minutes on proposed Route 20. Finally, proposed Route 335 would be a new service route resulting in all three of these proposed routes providing better access from a service characteristics standpoint in this area.

As shown in Figure 21, Route 100 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 100 currently provides service to 32 minority block groups. However, 29 of the 32 block groups are located within a one-half mile walk or less of proposed Routes 20 which follows the majority of the current Route 100, so
frequent bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups. The three block groups accessed by the current Route 100 but not the mitigation Route 20 are all located immediately east of IH-35, just east of Downtown Austin in East Austin. These block groups are served by proposed Route 322. Additionally, service frequency would increase from every 20 minutes to every 15 minutes along proposed Route 20. Service from airport would improve from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes. This results in the proposed route providing better access from a service characteristics standpoint in this area.
As shown in Figure 22, Route 127 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 127 currently provides service to 36 minority block groups. However, all of these block groups are located within a one-half mile walk or less of existing Route 7 which parallels the majority of the current Route 127, so frequent bus service to downtown would still be accessible to people living within these block groups.
As shown in Figure 23, Route 238 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 238 currently provides service to 19 minority block groups. However, all of these block groups would be directly served by the proposed Route 338 as this route would follow the same corridor as current Route 238 for the central portion of the route, so bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups.
As shown in Figure 24, Route 240 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 240 currently provides service to 33 minority block groups. However, all 33 of these block groups are all located within a one-half mile walk of proposed Routes 325 and existing Routes 1, 3, and 803, so frequent bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups. On the north end of the...
route, there are five bus stops served by the current route that would no longer be served that are within minority block groups and are not within a one-half mile walk of the mitigation Routes 325, 801, or 803. Two of these stops are located right on the edge of the one-half mile walk shed while the other three stops are all approximately a 0.7 mile walk to the proposed Route 325. These five stops have a total of 93 average weekday boardings with over two-thirds of the boardings at HEB at Parmer and MoPac. Due to the challenging street network in this area, it would be costly to modify other routes to serve this area.
As shown in Figure 25, Route 275 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 275 currently provides service to 29 minority block groups. However, all of these block groups would be directly served by proposed Route 1 as this route follows the same corridor as current Route 275, so bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups.
As shown in Figure 26, Route 320 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 320 currently provides service to 60 minority block groups. However, all of these block groups are within a one-half mile walk of mitigation routes 7, 19, and proposed mitigation routes 17, 300, 322, 335, 337, 345, so bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups.
As shown in Figure 27, Route 331 would be combined with proposed High Frequent Route 300 as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 331 currently provides service to 31 minority block groups. However, all of these block groups would be directly served by mitigation Routes 228, 300, and 311 as these routes serve the same corridor as current Route 331, so bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups. Additionally, service frequency on Route 311 would increase from...
every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes, so proposed Route 311 would provide better access from a service characteristics standpoint in this area as well.

Figure 28: Capital Metro Bus Route 464 (Planned for Elimination)

As shown in Figure 28, Route 464 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 464 connects the MLK Redline station to the Capitol Complex and currently provides service to 10 minority block groups. However, all of these block groups would be directly served by mitigation Route 18 as this route serves the same corridor as current Route 464, so frequent bus service would still be accessible to people living within these block groups. Additionally, service frequency on Route
18 would increase from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes, so proposed Route 18 would provide better access from a service characteristics standpoint in this area as well.

Figure 29: Capital Metro Bus Route 653 (Planned for Elimination)

As shown in Figure 29, Route 653 would be eliminated as part of the Connections 2025 service changes to be implemented in June 2018. The existing Route 653 is a UT Shuttle route connecting students to campus and currently provides service to six minority block groups. However, all of these block groups would be directly served by proposed Route 10 as this route serves the same corridor as current Route 653, so frequent bus service would still be accessible.
to people living within these block groups. Additionally, service frequency on Route 10 would increase from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes, so proposed Route 10 would provide better access from a service characteristics standpoint in this area as well.
Table 3 below provides results for new proposed bus routes planned for implementation in June 2018.

Table 3: Equity Analysis Results of Proposed New Bus Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Route BGs Total Population</th>
<th>Route BGs Minority Population</th>
<th>Route BGs % Minority</th>
<th>Service Area % Minority</th>
<th>Route % Minority Minus Service Area % Minority</th>
<th>Potential Minority Impact</th>
<th>Route BGs Poverty Households</th>
<th>Route BGs % Low Income</th>
<th>Route BGs % Low Income Service Area % Minority</th>
<th>Potential Low Income Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>61,426</td>
<td>23,556</td>
<td>38.35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>26,198</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>45,033</td>
<td>32,370</td>
<td>71.88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>20,008</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>47,719</td>
<td>19,201</td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>22,601</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>58,445</td>
<td>40,081</td>
<td>68.58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.58</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>24,460</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>35,510</td>
<td>10,413</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>17,109</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>40,272</td>
<td>33,738</td>
<td>83.78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.78</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>15,702</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-6.57</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>10,405</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HNTB, October 2017.
As shown in Table 3 there are seven new bus routes proposed for implementation as part of the Connections 2025 service changes. Five of these routes will provide additional services to high minority areas (as shown on Figures 30-34) while Routes 335 and 345 will provide services to minority populations that are just below the threshold of 33%. Ultimately, all of these routes will bring significant benefits to minority populations since a very high minority population will have access to these new routes. Although these routes will travel through minority areas, they may not cover very high low-income areas. So, we may see a lower degree of adverse effect on low-income populations since the benefits from these additional services may not reach to them proportionately.
Figure 30: Capital Metro Bus Route 105 (New Service)

* CapMetro current service area minority and low income make up: 33% of the area is minority
18% of households are defined as low income
A Low-Income household is a household that reported income in the 2010 census at or below 125% of 2015 DHHS poverty threshold.
Figure 31: Capital Metro Bus Route 310 (New Service)

*CapMetro current service area minority and low income make up:
33% of the area is minority
18% of households are defined as low income
A Low-Income household is a household that reported income in the 2010 census at or below 125% of 2015 DHHS poverty threshold.*
Figure 32: Capital Metro Bus Route 315 (New Service)

Block Groups - %Minority > 35%
- Proposed Route #315
- Minority Block Groups Served by New Route #315
- All Block Groups Served by Current Route #315

* CapMetro current service area minority and low income make up:
  33% of the area is minority
  18% of households are defined as low income
  A Low-Income household is a household that reported income in the 2010 census at or below 125% of 2015 DHHS poverty threshold.
Figure 33: Capital Metro Bus Route 324 (New Service)

* CapMetro current service area minority and low income make up: 33% of the area is minority
* 18% of households are defined as low income
* A Low-Income household is a household that reported income in the 2010 census at or below 125% of 2015 DHHS poverty threshold.
Figure 34: Capital Metro Bus Route 339 (New Service)

Block Groups - %Minority > 35%
- Proposed Route #339
- Minority Block Groups Served by New Route #324
- All Block Groups Served by Current Route #324

* CapMetro current service area minority and low income make up: 33% of the area is minority
18% of households are defined as low income
A Low-Income household is a household that reported income in the 2010 census at or below 125% of 2015 DHHS poverty threshold.
VI. Conclusion

When we considered individual changes, a potential disparate impact on minority populations was found for 11 of 13 routes that are proposed to be eliminated and 18 of 20 routes that are proposed for major service changes based on the policy thresholds for consideration. The potential disparate impacts are mitigated on almost all of the eliminated routes as these routes will be replaced or served by one or multiple new or changed routes. Similarly, most of the modified routes will be replaced or served by one or multiple routes. In fact, eight of those modified routes will have a significant frequency increase that will bring benefits of this service change to minority populations. In addition, there are five new routes that will provide services to significantly high minority population areas.

No disproportionate burden on the low-income population was found for any proposed eliminated and modified routes. When the new proposed routes are analyzed in isolation from the other proposed changes, the analysis identifies a potential for an adverse effect on the low-income population since the proposed new routes will not travel through many low-income areas. So, the benefits of the new routes may not go to low-income population proportionately. However, these new routes will greatly benefit identified minority populations and the increased frequency and other service improvements and modifications of the proposed changes will bring significant improvements in service to areas with high concentrations of low-income individuals.

Throughout the planning process, staff evaluated each change to determine whether any adverse effects would occur on minority or low-income populations. We applied “Avoid, Minimize, and Mitigate” principles to reduce disproportionate impacts. When staff did find a change that would impact one of these groups, available alternatives were identified including alternate trips and services that could provide comparable service. After considering public comments and other resources, the impact from the final proposed route changes has been reduced compared to the initial proposal. Appendix A on pages 65-68 provides information on how we considered public comments in order to finalize the route changes. In the final proposal, there are 13 routes proposed for elimination instead of 17, twenty (20) routes will see major changes instead of 22, and seven new routes will be added instead of five.
Capital Metro’s responsibility is to guarantee that all transit service, and access to its facilities, are equitably distributed and provided without regard to race, color, or national origin. Capital Metro’s goal is to also ensure equal opportunities to all individuals to participate in all local, sub regional and regional transit planning and decision-making processes. Capital Metro recognizes the importance of ensuring that internal processes, procedures, and policies for conducting any Title VI Equity analyses are clearly defined. Moving forward, we will review, assess, and propose any update or revision needed for our existing policies, procedures, and/or thresholds related to Title VI Equity Analysis to ensure that the census data and procedures include recent demographics of Austin area as permitted by the FTA Circular.

Capital Metro has conducted extensive public outreach regarding these proposed service changes. In the future, we will ensure that the equity analysis is available to the public through our website, social media, and other sources. We can also conduct a survey once the service is implemented to assess how the changes have affected riders.

As outlined in the FTA Circular 4702.1B, transit agencies “can implement major service changes or reductions that would have disproportionately high and adverse impacts provided that the recipient demonstrates that the action meets a substantial need that is in the public interest and that alternatives would have more severe adverse effects than the preferred alternative”.

All of these changes are designed to improve the entire transit system as a whole, including riding experience and operating efficiency. The number of minority and low-income people within the current Capital Metro service area, who will have faster, more reliable access to employment, healthcare, education, social services, and recreation opportunities available through these upcoming service changes, far exceeds the number of people potentially negatively affected by this change. Overall, the proposed service changes will have a positive impact within the system because of the level of investment proposed to increase capacity through additional trips on existing services. Based on this analysis, Capital Metro believes that these proposals do not violate federal mandates.
Appendix A - Consideration of Public Comments in the Planning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>Revise</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide direct service to Criss Cole Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reduces duplication on Medical Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Operate in addition to UT Shuttle on Speedway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UT Shuttle available / within quarter-mile of Frequent Route 7 (5 minute walk) and third of a mile of Route 1/MetroRapid 801 (6 minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Serve Greyhound Station</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Within quarter-mile of Frequent Route 7 (5 minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Keep Route 7 on Friedrich to Woodward</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Preserves access to employers and businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maintain service on Vargas (residential street) instead of proposed Montopolis (mixed use street)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Within quarter-mile of Frequent Route 17 (5 minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/22</td>
<td>Do not eliminate Routes 21/22</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All stops within a half-mile of Frequent Routes 4, 17, 18, 20 &amp; 335; Route 322; and UT Shuttle 663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Provide school trips to Small M.S.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Transfers available via Route 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Serve Perez Elementary School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Serves less than 13 boardings per day / Decreasing ridership with no growth potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Preserve service to Met Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Extend Route 271 to serve Met Center / Serves over 50 boardings per day at Met Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Preserve service to Anderson Mill neighborhood, Lakeline Mall, and NLTC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Serves over 180 boardings in Anderson Mill / Lakeline Mall and 375 boardings at NLTC (Cost balanced by uncoupling from Route 392)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Staff initiated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Route reinstated. Service would end at Burnet instead of Great Hills (served by Route 383) / Frequency adjusted to every 40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Continue to operate service at least one day a week</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other service available that operates 7 days per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Serve St. David's Medical Center North</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Serves less than 25 boardings per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Continue to operate on Heatherwilde</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reduces duplication on Howard and preserves current route at no additional cost (Cost balanced by reducing frequency to every 40 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Continue serving ACC Riverside</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operator input / Ability to transfer to multiple routes at ACC Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Preserve Route 300 service on Rogge (residential street) instead of proposed 51st (mixed use street)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Within a half-mile of Frequent Routes 10, 20 &amp; 300 (10 minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Serve Oak Hill Shopping Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Serves major destination with no significant route deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Preserve service on Tuscany Way</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Route 339 Tuscany providing 60 minute service (Cost balanced by removing proposed Route 323 extension to Far West - covered by Route 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Operator Comment</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maintain service between Capital Metro and downtown for operator relief (currently provided by Route 17)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Within quarter-mile of Frequent Route 4 located at 7th &amp; Pleasant Valley (5 minute walk) / Proposed Frequent Route 4 stops at 8th and Lavaca (current served by Route 17) and 7th and Colorado (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Routes</td>
<td>Ensure adequate recovery time</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Run time and recovery time will be evaluated as part of the schedule development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Routes</td>
<td>Ensure comfort stops at the end of each route</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Continue to provide at CMTA facilities / work with private entities on case by case basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed June 2018 Service Changes

Board of Directors Meeting – November 15, 2017
There Really Is A Problem

This slide highlights the problem of congestion in Austin, with a focus on travel time and equity in livability. It includes a Travel Time Index of 1.33, indicating that Austin's traffic conditions are significantly worse during rush hour compared to non-rush hour conditions. The slide also mentions the annual delay time, which is attributed to road congestion, and the need for continuous improvement in transportation to make travel time more affordable and livable for everyone.
There Really Is A Problem
(and it’s going to get worse)

“Forecasts suggest the population will more than double by 2040”
There Really Is A Problem

A bus network that is 9% slower due to congestion means:
- Operating costs
- Fleet requirements
- Service speed and reliability

Connections 2025 / June Service Proposal cannot fix alone, but can:
- Streamline routing
- Reduce circuitous travel patterns
- Position system for improved and additional transit priority
There Really Is A Problem


- System Total
- COA Population

- 25,000,000 to 950,000
It’s Our Duty to Tackle It

Vision

Capital Metro is transforming the daily lives of Central Texans by providing a robust, sustainable transportation network.

Mission

Capital Metro connects people, jobs and communities by providing quality transportation choices.

Capital Metro Strategic Plan Goal: Increase Ridership
It’s Our Duty to Tackle It

The following service design principles were selected in collaboration with the Capital Metro board of directors to meet the goals set forth in Connections 2025. The specific plan recommendations for Capital Metro service are guided by these design principles.

- Stronger Frequent Network
- Easy to Understand Network
- Grow Ridership and Productivity
- Match Service to Markets
Our Approach is Sensible

14% Increase in 2014 after renewed investment.
Our Approach is Sensible

More Frequent
- 14 High-Frequency Routes
- Departures at least every 15 minutes
- 7 days a week

June 2017
6 routes

Proposed June 2018
14 routes
Our Approach is Sensible

• Built on extensive and wide-ranging public engagement
• Based on best practices from transit agencies that are gaining riders
• Expands services that have been shown to attract more riders
• Creates a network of useful service
• Lays the groundwork for ‘new mobility’ future
New Analysis of the Proposal
Households in Poverty within 5-minute walk of Frequent Service

**Current**

15%

**Proposed June 2018**

27%
Households in Poverty within 10-minute walk of Frequent Service

**Current**
- 33%

**Proposed June 2018**
- 48%
Minority Population within 5-minute walk of Frequent Service

Current

12%

Proposed June 2018

22%
Minority Population within 10-minute walk of Frequent Service

Current: 25%

Proposed June 2018: 39%
Retaining Service to Current Customers

- 97.6% within 5-minute walk of service
  - Over 78% within 5-minute walk of frequent service
- 99.8% within 10-minute walk of service
  - Over 87% within 10-minute walk of frequent service
Meaningful Public Engagement

- Public Meetings & Webinars
- Capital Metro Advisory Committees
- City Boards & Commissions
- Neighborhood Associations
- Health and Human Service Agencies
  - HACA, Criss Cole, TWC, School for the Blind, others
- Business and advocacy organizations
Meaningful Public Engagement

• Street Teams at bus stops
• Community Events
  – Back to School, Hot Sauce Festival, Austin Energy Resource Fair, El Grito, etc.
• Schools and Service Providers
• CMTA operators
• Paid media – print, online and radio
• At-stop signage
Response to Issues and Concerns

• Considered changes to more than 20 routes
• As a direct result of public engagement process:
  – Nine service proposals modified
  – Four entire routes retained
  – Two major route changes removed
  – One entire route added to the plan
Response to Issues and Concerns

• If approved, major public outreach efforts forthcoming:
  – Jan.-June ’18: Extensive communications across all platforms to build awareness and assist with transition
  – June ’18: Comprehensive, ‘all hands on-deck’ approach to day of implementation and transition period thereafter
  – June-December ‘18: Thorough system and route level monitoring and development of any needed adjustments
Response to Issues and Concerns - MetroAccess Revised Proposal

- Retain existing MetroAccess service through June 2019
- Staff conducts analysis of usage, ridership patterns, costs and potential alternatives based on June-Dec. 2018 data
- Staff reports findings and options to Board of Directors (Feb. 2019)
- Board of Directors selects service alternatives to go into effect at end of one-year period (March 2019)
- Services adjusted based on Board direction (June 2019)
Title VI Analysis Results
(Civil Rights Act of 1964)

• Minority Populations:
  – Based on methodology, potential disparate impact on minority populations identified
  – All potential disparate impacts addressed

• Low-Income Populations:
  – No disproportionate burden found

• Summary and full report available on Capital Metro website
Today’s Request

- Approval of June 2018 Service Changes

METRO
A TRANSIT PLAN FOR THE FUTURE
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Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to extend an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin for employee transit passes for a period of 1 year from January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2018, and leave the CY2018 contract term not-to-exceed amount unchanged at $400,000.
SUBJECT:
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to extend an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin for employee transit passes for a period of 1 year from January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2018, and leave the CY2018 contract term not-to-exceed amount unchanged at $400,000.

FISCAL IMPACT:
This ILA is revenue-generating.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Strategic Goal Alignment:
3. Community

Strategic Objectives:
3.2 Build Strong Community Partnerships that further Capital Metro’s mission and vision.
3.4 Support plans and programs designed to build ridership and increase market share of alternate transit use.

EXPLANATION OF STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:
The ILA extension will maintain a strong partnership with the City of Austin that supports Capital Metro's mission and vision. The ILA extension has the potential to increase ridership on Capital Metro services and provide additional revenue.

BUSINESS CASE:
The ILA has helped establish a strong partnership with the City of Austin that supports Capital Metro's strategic objectives. The proposed extension will maintain this relationship. The ILA has positively impacted ridership and demand for Capital Metro’s services and has been well utilized by City of Austin employees. The proposed extension will encourage City of Austin employees to continue to make use of our services.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:
This agenda item will be presented to the full board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
As part of Capital Metro’s desire to build strong community partnerships that further Capital Metro’s mission and vision and as part of Capital Metro’s and the City of Austin’s continued joint effort to promote sustainability through transportation alternatives, this agreement extends an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin for employee transit passes for a period of 1 year from January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2018, and
leaves the CY2018 contract term not-to-exceed amount unchanged at $400,000.

DBE/SBE PARTICIPATION: Does not apply.

PROCUREMENT: Does not apply.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Marketing/Communications
RESOLUTION
OF THE
CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2017-595)
City of Austin ILA Extension

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management endeavor to build strong community partnerships that further Capital Metro’s mission and vision; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management recognize the need to build ridership and increase market share of alternate transit use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors that the President/CEO, or her designee, is authorized to extend an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin for employee transit passes for a period of one year from January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2018, and leave the CY2018 contract term not-to-exceed amount unchanged at $400,000.

________________________
Date: ____________________

Secretary of the Board
Juli Word
AGREEMENT BETWEEN

THE CITY OF AUSTIN
AND
CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
FOR
TRANSIT SERVICES

This agreement ("Agreement") effective January 1, 2016, is an Interlocal Agreement authorized and governed by the Interlocal Cooperation Act, Chapter 791 of the Texas Government Code. Each party represents and warrants that in the performance of its respective obligations as set forth in this Agreement, it is carrying out a duly authorized governmental function, which it is authorized to perform individually under the applicable statutes of the State of Texas and/or its charter. Each party represents and warrants that the compensation to be made to the performing party contemplated in this Agreement are in amounts that fairly compensate the performing party for the services or functions described in this Agreement, and are made from current revenues available to the paying party.

On November 12, 2015, the Austin City Council authorized the execution of this Interlocal Agreement with Capital Metro in an amount not to exceed $400,000, with four one year extension options in an amount not to exceed $400,000 per extension option, for a total contract amount not to exceed $2,000,000.

Recognizing the importance of a regional mobility system, and the desire to encourage city employees to access public transportation, the City of Austin, a home rule municipal corporation, ("City") and Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Capital Metro") a transportation authority organized under the provision of the Texas Transportation code, Chapter 451, enter into this Agreement as follows:

SECTION 1. GRANT OF AUTHORITY, SERVICES AND DUTIES

1.1 Engagement of Capital Metro. Subject to the provisions of the Terms and Conditions contained herein, Capital Metro is to provide the services set forth in Section 2, Scope of Work.

1.2 Responsibilities of Capital Metro. Capital Metro shall provide all technical and professional expertise, knowledge, management, and other resources required for accomplishing all aspects of the tasks and associated activities identified in the Scope of Work. In the event that the need arises for Capital Metro to perform services beyond those stated in the Scope of Work, Capital Metro and the City shall negotiate mutually agreeable terms and compensation for completing the additional services.

1.3 Responsibilities of the City. The City's Contract Manager will be responsible for exercising general oversight of the activities and services under this Agreement. Specifically, the Contract Manager will represent the City's interests in resolving day-to-day issues that may arise during the term of this Agreement. The City will participate regularly in conference calls or meetings for status reporting, promptly review any written reports submitted by Capital Metro, and approve all invoices for payment, as appropriate. The City's Contract Manager will provide Capital Metro timely feedback on the acceptability of progress and task reports.

1.4 Designation of Key Personnel. Capital Metro's Contract Manager for this agreement is Greg Buford, 512-389-7449. The City's Contract Manager for the engagement is Karen Haywood, 512-974-3465.

SECTION 2. SCOPE OF WORK

2.1 Capital Metro's Obligations. Capital Metro shall fully and timely provide all deliverables described herein in accordance with the terms, covenants, and conditions of the Agreement and all applicable Federal, State, and local laws, rules, and regulations.

2.2 Purpose. City employees shall have access and use of Capital Metro's Transportation Services which consist of bus service and rail service, MetroWorks vanpool service, and MetroAccess paratransit service (collectively, the "Services") upon presentation of a valid transportation pass.
2.3 Tasks.

2.3.1 Capital Metro shall allow City employees to have unlimited use of Capital Metro's bus and rail services upon presentation of a valid transit pass and City of Austin identification badge if requested. Capital Metro shall deliver annual transit passes for bus and rail service, RideShare, and MetroAccess to the City of Austin Human Resources Department who will distribute the passes to employees. Capital Metro shall deliver 5,000 transit passes, 200 RideShare passes, and 50 MetroAccess passes to the City no later than December 1, 2015, and December 1 each subsequent year of the contract.

2.3.2 Capital Metro shall monitor, compile and analyze the bus and rail ridership data through the use of transportation passes, at bus fare boxes and rail platform card validators, and provide quarterly agreed upon reports to the City based on this data. Capital Metro and the City will reconcile RideShare and MetroAccess services and employee eligibility each month. Capital Metro will submit quarterly invoices for these services based on these reconciliations. Quarterly invoices for all services will be submitted simultaneously with the ridership data reports.

2.3.3 The City shall promote transit use to their employees with the assistance of the Capital Metro Community Involvement Office.

2.3.4 Eligible MetroAccess employee must follow Capital Metro’s process for reservations and services.

2.3.5 Capital Metro and the City mutually understand the need for coordination and prior approval(s) of their respective governing bodies regarding services, activities and initiatives that involve additional funds.

SECTION 3. COMPENSATION

3.1 Agreement Amount. In exchange and receipt for transportation services, Capital Metro will be paid an amount not to exceed $400,000 for the initial period, and $400,000 for each of the four one-year extensions for a total amount not to exceed $2,000,000.

3.1.2 The City shall reimburse Capital Metro for all bus and rail and rail services for each City employee ride at the following rates.

3.1.2.1 For the period of January 1, 2016, through December 31, 2016, the reimbursement rate is $0.75 for all Local service (Metro and Downtown Connector), $1.15 for all Premium service (MetroRapid and Flyer), and $2.00 for all Commuter service (Rail and Express).

3.1.2.2 For the period of January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2020, the reimbursement rate is $0.85 for all Local service (Metro and Downtown Connector), $1.25 for all Premium service (MetroRapid and Flyer), and $2.45 for all Commuter service (Rail and Express).

3.1.3 Capital Metro will be reimbursed $70.00 a month per employee for access to RideShare vanpool services. Employees will reimburse Capital Metro (or a designated contractor) for any fees exceeding the $70.00 paid by the City for vanpool services.

3.1.4 Capital Metro will be reimbursed $46.50 a month per employee for access to MetroAccess paratransit services. Employees will reimburse Capital Metro (or a designated contractor) for any fees exceeding the $46.50 paid by the City for paratransit services.

3.1.5 The City shall reimburse Capital Metro for the cost of printing 5,250 transportation passes (bus, vanpool, and paratransit) for Services at a rate of $0.45 a pass for a yearly cost of $2,362.50. If additional passes are required the City will reimburse Capital Metro for these at the rate of $0.45 per pass.

3.2 Invoices. Capital Metro will submit quarterly invoices with ridership data to the City.

3.2.1 Based upon reconciled ridership services and employee eligibility each quarter, Capital Metro shall submit itemized invoices including ridership data reports for bus, rail, vanpool, and paratransit services.
3.2.2 Invoices shall contain a non-duplicated invoice number, the purchase order or delivery order number and the master agreement number if applicable, the Department’s Name, and the name of the point of contact for the Department. Invoices shall be itemized and submitted no later than 30 days after the end of each quarter. Unless otherwise instructed in writing, the City may rely on the remittance address specified on the Capital Metro’s invoice. Invoices received without all required information cannot be processed and will be returned to the Capital Metro. Invoices shall be mailed to the below address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Austin</th>
<th>Human Resources Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attn:</td>
<td>Karen Haywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>P. O. Box 1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip Code</td>
<td>Austin, Texas 78767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Payment.

3.3.1 All proper invoices received by the City will be paid within thirty (30) calendar days of the City’s receipt of the invoice and ridership data reports.

3.3.2 If payment is not timely made, (per this paragraph), interest shall accrue on the unpaid balance at the lesser of one percent (1%) per month or the maximum lawful rate; except, if payment is not timely made for a reason for which the City may withhold payment hereunder, interest shall not accrue until ten (10) calendar days after the grounds for withholding payment have been resolved.

3.3.3 Notice is hereby given of Article VIII, Section 1 of the Austin City Charter which prohibits the payment of any money to any person, firm or corporation who is in arrears to the City for taxes, and of §2-8-3 of the Austin City Code concerning the right of the City to offset indebtedness owed the City.

3.4 Non-Appropriation. The awarding or continuation of this Agreement is dependent upon the availability of funding. The City’s payment obligations are payable only and solely from funds Appropriated and available for this Agreement. The absence of Appropriated or other lawfully available funds will render the Agreement null and void to the extent funds are not Appropriated or available and any deliverables delivered but unpaid will be returned to Capital Metro. The City will provide Capital Metro written notice of the failure of the City to make an adequate Appropriation for any fiscal year to pay the amounts due under the Agreement, or the reduction of any Appropriation to an amount insufficient to permit the City to pay its obligations under the Agreement. In the event of non or inadequate appropriation of funds, there will be no penalty nor removal fees charged to the City. The City shall be responsible for payment for all services through the date of the termination and upon termination City employees shall cease to utilize the transportation passes for Capital Metro services.

SECTION 4. TERM AND TERMINATION

4.1 Term. This Agreement shall become effective on January 1, 2016, and may be extended thereafter for up to four (4) twelve (12) month extension periods in the amount per extension as described in Section 3.1, provided the Capital Metro Board authorized the President/CEO or her designee and the City Purchasing Officer or his designee agree in writing to the extension option.

4.2 Right to Assurance. Whenever one party to the Agreement in good faith has reason to question the other party’s intent to perform, demand may be made to the other party for written assurance of the intent to perform. In the event that no assurance is given within the time specified after demand is made, the demanding party may treat this failure as an anticipatory repudiation of the Agreement.

4.3 Default. Either party shall be in default under the Agreement if either party (a) fails to fully, timely and faithfully perform any of its material obligations under the Agreement, or (b) fails to provide adequate assurance of performance under the Right to Assurance paragraph contained herein.

4.4 Termination. Either party shall have the right to terminate the Agreement, in whole or in part, without cause any time upon thirty (30) calendar days’ prior written notice. Upon receipt of a notice of termination, Capital Metro shall promptly cease all further work pursuant to the Agreement, with such exceptions, if any.
specified in the notice of termination. The City will pay Capital Metro, to the extent of funds Appropriated or otherwise legally available for such purposes, for all goods delivered and services performed and obligations incurred prior to the date of termination in accordance with the terms hereof.

SECTION 5. OTHER DELIVERABLES

5.1 **Insurance.**

5.1.1 **General Requirements.** Capital Metro maintains general liability and auto liability risk coverage through the Texas Municipal League Risk Pool and shall provide evidence of coverage to the City upon request.

5.1.2 **Bus Operator Requirements.** Capital Metro shall require its bus operator contractors to carry at a minimum carry insurance in the types and amounts indicated below for the duration of the Agreement and shall provide the City with evidence thereof upon request.

5.1.2.1 **Commercial General Liability Insurance.** The minimum bodily injury and property damage per occurrence are $500,000 for coverage A (Bodily Injury and Property Damage) and B (Personal and Advertising Injuries). The policy shall contain the following provisions and endorsements.

5.1.2.1.1 Blanket contractual liability coverage for liability assumed under the Agreement and all other Contracts related to the project.
5.1.2.1.2 Independent Contractor’s Coverage.
5.1.2.1.3 Products/Completed Operations Liability for the duration of the warranty period.
5.1.2.1.4 The City of Austin listed as an additional insured, Endorsement CG 2010, or equivalent coverage.

5.1.2.2 **Business Automobile Liability Insurance.** Capital Metro shall provide coverage for all owned, non-owned and hired vehicles with a minimum combined single limit of $500,000 per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage. Alternate acceptable limits are $250,000 bodily injury per person, $500,000 bodily injury per occurrence and at least $100,000 property damage liability per accident.

5.2 **Equal Opportunity.**

5.2.1 **Equal Employment Opportunity.** This Agreement does not abrogate Capital Metro’s responsibility to comply with all applicable federal, state and local non-discrimination laws.

5.2.2 **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance.** Capital Metro or Capital Metro’s agent shall engage in any discriminatory employment practice against individuals with disabilities as defined in the ADA.

5.3 **Rights to Contractual Material.** All material submitted by Capital Metro to the City shall become property of the City upon receipt. Any portions of such material claimed by Capital Metro to be proprietary must be clearly marked as such. Determination of the public nature of the material is subject to the Open Records Act, Chapter 552, of the Texas Government Code.

SECTION 6. MISCELLANEOUS

6.1 **Compliance with Health, Safety, and Environmental Regulations.** Capital Metro, its Subcontractors, and their respective employees, shall comply fully with all applicable federal, state, and local health, safety, and environmental laws, ordinances, rules and regulations in the performance of the services, including but not limited to those promulgated by the City. In case of conflict, the most stringent safety requirement shall govern.

6.2 **Right to Audit.**

6.2.1 Capital Metro agrees that the representatives of the Office of the City Auditor or other authorized representatives of the City will have access to and the rights to audit, examines, or reproduce...
and all records of Capital Metro related to the performance under this Agreement. Capital Metro shall retain all such records for a period of three (3) years after final payment on this Agreement or until all audit and litigation matters that the City has brought to the attention of Capital Metro are resolved, whichever is longer. Capital Metro agrees to refund to the City any overpayments disclosed by any such audit.

6.3 **Claims.** If any claim, demand, suit, or other action is asserted against Capital Metro which arises under or concerns the Agreement, or which could have a material adverse effect on Capital Metro’s ability to perform thereunder, Capital Metro shall give written notice thereof to the City within ten (10) calendar days after receipt of notice by Capital Metro. Such notice to the City shall state the date of notification of any such claim, demand, suit, or other action; the names and addresses of the claimant(s); the basis thereof; and the name of each person against whom such claim is being asserted. Such notice shall be delivered personally or by mail and shall be sent to the City and to the Austin City Attorney. Personal delivery to the City Attorney shall be to City Hall, 301 West Second Street, Fourth Floor, Austin, Texas 78701, and mail delivery shall be to P.O. Box 1088, Austin, Texas 78767.

6.4 **Notices.** Unless otherwise specified, all notices, requests, or other communications required or appropriate to be given under the Agreement shall be in writing and shall be deemed delivered three (3) business days after postmarked if sent by U.S. Postal Service Certified or Registered Mail, Return Receipt Requested. Notices delivered by other means shall be deemed delivered upon receipt by the addressee. Routine communications may be made by first class mail, telefax, or other commercially accepted means. Notices to the City and Capital Metro shall be addressed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To the City:</th>
<th>To Capital Metro:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Austin, Purchasing Office</td>
<td>Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Contract Administrator</td>
<td>Attention: Vice President Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional copy to: Kerri L. Butcher, Chief Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P O Box 1088</td>
<td>2910 East Fifth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX 78767</td>
<td>Austin, Texas 78702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 **Advertising.** Neither party shall advertise or publish works without the other party’s prior consent nor the fact that both parties have entered into this Agreement, except to the extent required by law.

6.6 **Independent Contractor.** The Agreement shall not be construed as creating an employer/employee relationship, a partnership, or a joint venture. Capital Metro’s services shall be those of an independent contractor. Capital Metro agrees and understands that the Agreement does not grant any rights or privileges established for employees of the City.

6.7 **Modifications.** The Agreement can be modified or amended only by written documentation signed by both parties. No pre-printed or similar terms on any Capital Metro invoice, order or other document shall have any force or effect to change the terms, covenants, and conditions of the Agreement. The City Manager and the Capital Metro President/CEO will have the authority to negotiate and execute amendments to this Agreement without further City Council action or action from the Capital Metro Board of Directors, but only to the extent necessary to implement and further the clear intent of the respective City substantive modification of the terms and conditions hereof or otherwise violate Chapter 791 of the Texas Government Code. Any amendments that would constitute a substantive modification to the Agreement must be approved by the governing bodies of the Parties.

6.8 **Interpretation.** The Agreement is intended by the parties as a final, complete and exclusive statement of the terms of their agreement. No course of prior dealing between the parties or course of performance or usage of the trade shall be relevant to supplement or explain any term used in the Agreement. Although the Agreement may have been substantially drafted by one party, it is the intent of the parties that all provisions be construed in a manner to be fair to both parties, reading no provisions more strictly against one party or the other. Whenever a term defined by the Uniform Commercial Code, as enacted by the State of Texas, is used in the Agreement, the UCC definition shall control, unless otherwise defined in the Agreement.

6.9 **Dispute Resolution.** If a dispute arises out of or relates to the Agreement, or the breach thereof, the parties agree to negotiate prior to prosecuting a suit for damages. However, this section does not prohibit the filing of a lawsuit to toll the running of a statute of limitations or to seek injunctive relief. Either party may
8.3.b

make a written request for a meeting between representatives of each party within fourteen (14) calendar days after receipt of the request or such later period as agreed by the parties. Each party shall include, at a minimum, one (1) senior level individual with decision-making authority regarding the dispute. The purpose of this and any subsequent meeting is to attempt in good faith to negotiate a resolution of the dispute.

6.10 Jurisdiction and Venue. The Agreement is made under and shall be governed by the laws of the State of Texas, including, when applicable, the Uniform Commercial Code as adopted in Texas, V.T.C.A., Bus. & Comm. Code, Chapter 1, excluding any rule or principle that would refer to and apply the substantive law of another state or jurisdiction. All issues arising from this Agreement shall be resolved in the courts of Travis County, Texas and the parties agree to submit to the exclusive personal jurisdiction of such courts. The foregoing, however, shall not be construed or interpreted to limit or restrict the right or ability of the City to seek and secure injunctive relief from any competent authority as contemplated herein.

6.11 Invalidity. The invalidity, illegality, or unenforceability of any provision of the Agreement shall in no way affect the validity or enforceability of any other portion or provision of the Agreement. Any void provision shall be deemed severed from the Agreement and the balance of the Agreement shall be construed and enforced as if the Agreement did not contain the particular portion or provision held to be void. The parties further agree to reform the Agreement to replace any stricken provision with a valid provision that comes as close as possible to the intent of the stricken provision. The provisions of this section shall not prevent this entire Agreement from being void should a provision which is the essence of the Agreement be determined to be void.

6.12 Waiver; Consents. No consent or waiver, express or implied, by either party hereto or of any breach or default by the other party in the performance by the other of its obligations hereunder shall be valid unless in writing, and no such consent or waiver shall be deemed or construed to be a consent or waiver to or of any other breach or default in the performance by such other party of the same or any other obligations of such party hereunder. Failure on the part of either party to complain of any act or failure to act of the other party or to declare the other party in default, irrespective of how long such failure continues, shall not constitute a waiver by such party of its rights hereunder. The granting of any consent or approval in any other instance by or on behalf of any party hereto shall not be construed to waive or limit the need for such consent in any other or subsequent instance.

6.13 Force Majeure. Neither party shall be liable for any default or delay in the performance of its obligations under this Contract if, while and to the extent such default or delay is caused by acts of God, fire, riots, civil commotion, labor disruptions, sabotage, sovereign conduct, or any other cause beyond the reasonable control of such Party. In the event of default or delay in contract performance due to any of the foregoing causes, then the time for completion of the services will be extended; provided, however, in such an event, a conference will be held within three (3) business days to establish a mutually agreeable period of time reasonably necessary to overcome the effect of such failure to perform.

6.14 Remedies. All rights, powers and remedies granted to either party by any particular term of this Agreement are in addition to, and not in limitation of, any rights, powers or remedies which it has under any other term of this Agreement, at common law, in equity, by statute, or otherwise. All such rights powers and remedies may be exercised separately or concurrently, in such order and as often as may be deemed expedient by either party. No delay or omission by either party to exercise any right, power or remedy shall impair such right, power or remedy or be construed to be a waiver of or an acquiescence to any breach or default. A waiver by either party of any breach or default hereunder shall not constitute a waiver of any subsequent breach or default.

6.15 Assignment. No party here to shall have the right, power or authority to assign this Agreement, or any portion hereof or any monies due or to become due hereunder, without the prior written approval of the other party.

6.16 Successor in Interest. All of the rights, benefits, duties, liabilities, and obligations of the parties hereto shall inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the parties and their permitted successors and assigns and nothing expressed or mentioned in this Agreement is intended or shall be construed to give any other person any legal or equitable right, remedy or claim under or in respect of this Agreement or any provisions of this Agreement; this Agreement and conditions and provisions hereof being intended to be and being for the sole and exclusive benefit of the parties and for the benefit of no other person.
6.17 **Right to Sue.** Capital Metro and the City have the exclusive right to bring suit to enforce this Agreement, and no other party may bring suit, as a third party beneficiary or otherwise, to enforce this agreement.

6.18 **Holidays.** The following holidays are observed by the City:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holiday</th>
<th>Date Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Year's Day</td>
<td>January 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Birthday</td>
<td>Third Monday in January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Day</td>
<td>Third Monday in February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day</td>
<td>Last Monday in May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day</td>
<td>July 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day</td>
<td>First Monday in September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran's Day</td>
<td>November 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving Day</td>
<td>Fourth Thursday in November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday after Thanksgiving</td>
<td>Friday after Thanksgiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Eve</td>
<td>December 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Day</td>
<td>December 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a Legal Holiday falls on Saturday, it will be observed on the preceding Friday. If a Legal Holiday falls on Sunday, it will be observed on the following Monday.

6.19 **Incorporation of Documents.** Section 0100, Standard Purchase Definitions, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were incorporated in full text. The full text versions of this Section are attached and are available on the Internet at the following online address: [https://austintexas.gov/department/standard-bid-documents](https://austintexas.gov/department/standard-bid-documents).

In witness whereof, the parties have caused duly authorized representatives to execute this Agreement on the dates set forth below.

**CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

By: [Signature]

Name: **LINDA WATSON**

Printed Name: [Printed Name]

Title: [Title]

Date: [Date]

Approved as to Form: [Approved as to Form]

CMTA Legal Department

**CITY OF AUSTIN**

By: [Signature]

Name: **Mark A. Washington**

Printed Name: [Printed Name]

Title: **Deputy Assistant City Man**

Date: [Date]

Approved as to Form: [Approved as to Form]

Assistant City Attorney
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute a contract modification with Krauthamer & Associates for executive recruiting services to increase the amount by $87,000 for a total not to exceed contract amount of $648,000 for one year with four 12 month options.
SUBJECT:
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute a contract modification with Krauthamer & Associates for executive recruiting services to increase the amount by $87,000 for a total not to exceed contract amount of $648,000 for one year with four 12 month options.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding for this action is available in the FY2018 Operating Budget.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Strategic Goal Alignment:
4. Human Capital

Strategic Objectives:
4.1 Enhance organizational development,
4.3 Be an Employer of Choice

EXPLANATION OF STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:
Utilization of an experienced executive search firm supports organization development by recruiting talent to lead Capital Metro’s initiatives. The executive search process utilized by Krauthamer also promotes Capital Metro’s objective of being an “Employer of Choice” by seeking candidates with exceptional leadership skills.

BUSINESS CASE:
Executive recruiting services supplement Capital Metro’s Human Resources Department by identifying and screening candidates for hard to fill and highly visible positions.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:
This agenda item will be presented to the full board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Capital Metro desires to continue employing the services of Krauthamer & Associates for executive recruitment. In the current contract year, their services are required for the recruitment of the President/CEO and Vice President, Rail Operations and requests the Board approve a modification to the current contract adding staff to the price for the current year. This will accommodate anticipated needs through the completion of the required transactions related to travel and advertising for the President/CEO position and additional recruiting for the Vice President, Rail Operations. No charge is being proposed to funds for the option years at this time.

DBE/SBE PARTICIPATION: Does not apply.
PROCUREMENT:
On March 23, 2017, Capital Metro awarded a contract to Krauthamer & Associates for Executive Recruitment Services in an amount not to exceed $101,000 for the base year to provide Capital Metro with an executive search agency in the event of a vacancy of top level positions, to be assigned as needed. The contract was awarded based on the need of no more than one top level position a year. The contract has four (4) option periods of twelve months’ duration each. In July 2017, Linda Watson announced her retirement effective December 31, 2017. The Board approved using Krauthamer & Associates for the recruitment of the new President/CEO. In the last month, it has also become necessary to recruit for the Vice President, Rail Operations. To accommodate the additional recruitment for the Vice President, Rail Operations position, which includes candidate travel and advertising, an increase of $87,000 is requested for a total not to exceed amount of $188,000 for the Base Year (Year 1) and $115,000 for each subsequent Option Year (Years 2-5), for a total contract amount of $648,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Term</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Year 1 (Awarded)</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Year 1 (Modification Request)</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Year 1 (Year 2)</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Year 2 (Year 3)</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Year 3 (Year 4)</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Year 4 (Year 5)</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contract Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>$648,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This contract was not previously approved by the board because the annual contract amount was below the board approval threshold of $150,000.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Human Resources
RESOLUTION
OF THE
CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2017-611)
Contract Modification with Krauthamer & Associates for Executive Recruitment

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board Directors and Capital Metro management endeavor to adequately staff the President/CEO and Vice President, Rail Operations, utilizing the services of an executive search firm; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management understand the executive search firm Krauthamer & Associates is currently providing such services to Capital Metro and their continued services are required.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors that the President/CEO, or her designee, is authorized to finalize and execute a contract modification with Krauthamer & Associates for executive recruiting services and increase the amount by $87,000 for a total not to exceed amount of $648,000 for one year with four 12 month options.

________________________
Date: ____________________

Secretary of the Board
Juli Word
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute a contract with Bytemark, Inc. for the implementation of software upgrades to the trip planning and traveler tools system in an amount not to exceed $373,460 for one-time implementation costs plus a one-year option of $98,628 for a total not to exceed $472,088.
SUBJECT:
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to finalize and execute a contract with Bytemark, Inc. for the implementation of software upgrades to the trip planning and traveler tools system in an amount not to exceed $373,460 for one-time implementation costs plus a one-year option of $98,628 for a total not to exceed amount of $472,088.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding for this action is available in the FY2018 Capital Budget.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Strategic Goal Alignment:
1. Customer
2. Ridership
3. Community

Strategic Objectives:
1.2 Improve system reliability and convenience,
1.4 Deliver a customer-friendly experience through our people and systems,
2.3 Pursue service expansion opportunities,
3.4 Support plans and programs designed to build ridership and increase market share of alternate transit use. (This requires support from all departments including planning, IT, Ops, and Marketing)

EXPLANATION OF STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:
The proposed trip planning and traveler tools upgrade will provide additional functionality that will directly improve Capital Metro’s current traveler tools system used on the website and CapMetro app. Upgrades include a multi-modal trip planner; additional service change and detour information on the web, mobile app, automated telephone and text message system; and additional mobile payment options such as Android Pay and Apple Pay in the CapMetro app on mobile devices. These upgrades align with Capital Metro’s Strategic Objectives 1.2, 1.4, 2.3, 3.4.

BUSINESS CASE:
The software upgrades will leverage Capital Metro’s investment in the trip planning and traveler tool system by expanding the existing functionality to enhance the ease of use and capabilities of the system. The improvements will provide additional conveniences such as allowing riders to create multi-modal trip plans that combine Capital Metro’s transit services and private transportation companies using Austin’s bike share, car share, and ride share options.
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:
This agenda item will be presented to the full board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Capital Metro first contracted with Bytemark, Inc. in May 2013 for the implementation of the mobile ticketing system which provides the CapMetro mobile app, MetroRapid vehicle onboard validators, fare evasion system, back end management module, and subsequently contracted for enhancements including trip planning and traveler tools. The proposed upgrades will implement additional functionality that will improve the customer experience with Capital Metro’s trip planning and traveler tools. Key enhancements include improvements to provide multi-modal trip plans, additional service change including Connections 2025 and detour information in the website, mobile app, automated telephone and text message system, and additional mobile payments options such as Android Pay and Apple Pay in the CapMetro app on mobile devices.

DBE/SBE PARTICIPATION: Does not apply.

PROCUREMENT: On 06/22/2017 a Notice of Intent to Award Sole Source was published for two weeks on DemandStar as well as in the lobby at 2910 E. 5th Street, Austin, TX 78702 and on Capital Metro's website. This sole source requirement meets the conditions of FAR 13.106-1(b) (2); only one responsible source has been identified as reasonably available to perform enhancements to the proprietary Bytemark, Inc. Bytemark, Inc. submitted its initial technical and price proposal on 9/28/17. After review a clarification was requested. Bytemark, Inc. submitted its technical and price proposals on 10/20/17. A cost analysis of the price proposal was performed and the price has been determined fair and reasonable.

The proposed period of performance is one (1) year. There is one (1) twelve-month extension option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing Costs</th>
<th>Base period NTP to June 11, 2018</th>
<th>Option 1: June 11, 2018 to June 11, 2018</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Support</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$98,628</td>
<td>$98,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ongoing Costs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$98,628</td>
<td>$98,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Ongoing Costs $98,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One Time Implementation Costs $373,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Board Award $472,088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Information Technology
RESOLUTION
OF THE
CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2017-513)
Bytemark Trip Planning Module Enhancement

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management recognize the need to supplement and improve the current trip planning and traveler tool system with additional functionality to support the agency’s programs to build ridership and transit use; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management endeavor to finalize and execute a contract with Bytemark, Inc. for the implementation of system upgrades to its current trip planning and traveler tools system.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors that the President/CEO, or her designee, is authorized to finalize and execute a contract with Bytemark, Inc. for the implementation of software upgrades to the trip planning and traveler tools system in an amount not to exceed $373,460 for one time implementation costs plus a one year option of $98,628 for a total not to exceed amount of $472,088.

________________________
Date: ____________________

Secretary of the Board
Juli Word
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to execute a contract with Creative Bus Sales, utilizing the Buy Board Purchasing Cooperative, to purchase up to twenty-two Champion Paratransit Vans in an amount not to exceed $2,117,371.
SUBJECT:
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to execute a contract with Creative Bus Sales, utilizing the Buy Board Purchasing Cooperative, to purchase up to twenty-three Champion Paratransit Vans in an amount not to exceed $2,117,371.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding for this action is available in the FY2018 Capital Budget.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Strategic Goal Alignment:
1. Customer
5. Finance

Strategic Objectives:
1.1 Promote a culture of safety
1.3 Ensure an attractive and accessible transit environment
5.3 Continue commitment to State of Good Repair (SOGR) and transit asset management

EXPLANATION OF STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:
Replacement of Capital Metro’s revenue paratransit fleet on a scheduled basis will ensure the reliability of safe and accessible transportation in the Austin area and will continue our commitment to maintain assets in a state of good repair.

BUSINESS CASE:
This portion of the current fleet of paratransit vehicles has reached end of life and is due for replacement. The current fleet is comprised of 116 vans and minivans. This procurement will allow for the replacement of 22 of these life-expired vehicles.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:
This agenda item will be presented to the full board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Large wheelchair accessible vans are necessary to provide an efficient paratransit service. The vans being purchased will carry a combination of up to 3 passengers in wheelchairs and/or up to 8 ambulatory passengers. These vans will replace existing paratransit vehicles which have fulfilled their anticipated life cycle. One van being purchased will replace a van which was in an accident and damaged beyond repair.

DBE/SBE PARTICIPATION: DBE goals do not apply as the solicitation requires a
Transit Vehicle Manufacturer Certificate (TVM).

PROCUREMENT:
The contract will utilize the Houston-Galveston Area Council (HGAC) Contract No. BT01-17 held by Creative Bus Sales, Inc. to sell Champion Challenger Paratransit Vans.

HGAC awarded contracts are made available for use by Capital Metro via Title 7, Intergovernmental Relations Chapter 791, Interlocal Cooperation Contracts and The Texas Interlocal Cooperation Act.

Purchases made using HGAC contracts satisfy otherwise applicable competitive bidding requirements. Pricing for the Champion Challenger Paratransit Vans was determined to be fair & reasonable by the HGAC during its solicitation and award process.

HGAC pricing for (23) Champion Challenger Paratransit Vans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price Per Paratransit Van</th>
<th>Total Amount of Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018, Champion Challenger Paratransit Vans Gasoline fueled with 2 wheelchair capacity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$91,630.39</td>
<td>$1,191,195.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018, Champion Challenger Paratransit Vans Gasoline fueled with 3 wheelchair capacity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$92,617.54</td>
<td>$926,175.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,117,370.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contract is a fixed price contract.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Bus and Paratransit Services
RESOLUTION
OF THE
CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2017-602)
Paratransit Vans

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management endeavor to provide reliable and accessible service; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management recognize the need to acquire new vehicles to replace end of service life vehicles.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors that the President/CEO, or her designee, is authorized to execute a contract with Creative Bus Sales, utilizing the Buy Board Purchasing Cooperative, to purchase up to twenty-three Champion Paratransit Vans, in an amount not to exceed $2,117,371.

________________________
Date: _____________________

Secretary of the Board
Juli Word
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to extend and confirm the termination date of the existing Bus Stop Accessibility Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin on May 22, 2019.
SUBJECT: Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to extend and confirm the termination date of the existing Bus Stop Accessibility Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin on May 22, 2019.

FISCAL IMPACT: This action has no fiscal impact.

STRATEGIC PLAN: Strategic Goal Alignment:
1. Customer,
2. Ridership,
3. Community,
5. Finance

Strategic Objectives:
1.3 Ensure an attractive and accessible transit environment,
1.4 Deliver a customer-friendly experience through our people and systems,
2.1 Foster a new regional vision,
2.3 Pursue service expansion opportunities,
3.3 Create service strategies that utilize community and stakeholder feedback,
5.2 Implement sustainability and environmental stewardship

EXPLANATION OF STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT: The continuation of this ILA will allow Capital Metro to design, build and implement accessible bus stops and connecting sidewalks in the Capital Metro service area.

BUSINESS CASE: The current ILA establishes a partnership between the City of Austin and Capital Metro which provides for the construction of new accessible bus stops up to the confirmed termination date.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: This agenda item will be presented to the full board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Capital Metro and the City of Austin entered into an ILA on September 14, 2011. This ILA allowed Capital Metro to partner with the City of Austin for the cooperative development and construction of accessible sidewalks and associated pedestrian improvements at and near Capital Metro bus stops. A First Amendment executed on May 22, 2013 states: "Subject to the availability of funding, this Amendment will automatically renew from year to year for a term of (6) years and will continue in force
and effect until the completion of the warranty period for the then applicable portions of
the Project still in effect and any litigation or other matters surviving the completion of
the Project, unless terminated earlier by the Parties."

The Board resolution approving the First Amendment approved automatic renewal from
year to year for a term of five (5) years. Therefore, additional action is required to
extend and confirm the termination date as negotiated and approved by the City of
Austin.

DBE/SBE PARTICIPATION: Does not apply.

PROCUREMENT: Does not apply.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Capital Projects
RESOLUTION
OF THE
CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2017-604)
Existing Bus Stop Accessibility ILA Date Modification

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management endeavor to confirm the termination date of the existing Bus Stop Accessibility Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin to be May 22, 2019 as interpreted by the City of Austin; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors and Capital Metro management understand that the continuation of this ILA will allow Capital Metro to design, build and implement accessible bus stops and connecting sidewalks in the Capital Metro service area.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors that the President/CEO, or her designee, is authorized to clarify and confirm the termination date of the existing Bus Stop Accessibility Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Austin to be May 22, 2019.

________________________
Date: ____________________

Secretary of the Board
Juli Word
Review of proposed changes to Capital Metro Board Bylaws.
SUBJECT:
Approval of a resolution authorizing the President/CEO, or her designee, to approve amendments to the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors Bylaws.

FISCAL IMPACT:
This action has no fiscal impact.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Strategic Goal Alignment:
4. Human Capital

Strategic Objectives:
4.1 Enhance organizational development

EXPLANATION OF STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:
The Bylaws of the Board of Directors provide the governing principles and requirements of the Board of Directors for efficient operation of the Board and compliance with statute.

BUSINESS CASE:
The proposed amendments to the Bylaws of the Board of Directors will conform them to changes in the law, codify current practices and incorporate best practices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:
This agenda item will be presented to the full board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The Board of Directors has adopted Bylaws for the conduct of business under Section 451.517 of the Transportation Code. These bylaws conform to the requirements of state statute and provide governance on membership, meetings and other requirements of the Board.

The Board Bylaws were last amended in 2009. The proposed amendments would conform the bylaws to current statutory requirements and existing Capital Metro Board practices and reflect the addition of best practices for governance. The content has also been reformatted for easier reference.

The proposed substantive changes to the bylaws are as follows:
- Sec. 3.4.3 Duties of the Secretary. The proposed addition would authorize the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson to certify and sign documents in the absence of the Secretary.
- Sec. 5.4.2. Roll Call Voting Procedure. The proposed addition establishes that votes are taken by voice unless a roll call vote is requested by two board members prior to the vote or the Chairperson is unclear about the results of the vote.

- Sec. 6.1.1. Membership on Board Committees. The proposed addition creates a requirement for electing a committee Vice Chairperson to serve in the absence of the Chairperson.

- Sec. 8.6. Policies. The proposed addition would require the board to review and update, if required, all of its adopted policies every five years.

Modifications to the bylaws require an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the appointed and qualified members of the board. As required by the bylaws, the proposed modifications will be presented for discussion at the November Board of Directors meeting and submitted for approval at the December Board meeting.

DBE/SBE PARTICIPATION: Does not apply.

PROCUREMENT: Does not apply.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT: Legal
RESOLUTION
OF THE
CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2017-600)
Revisions to Board of Directors Bylaws

WHEREAS, the Board may by resolution adopt rules and bylaws for the conduct of Board meetings in accordance with Section 451.517 of the Texas Transportation Code; and

WHEREAS, the Board may amend such bylaws at any regular meeting of the Board by a two-thirds vote of the Board members, provided that the amendment has been submitted in writing at the previous regular meeting of the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board has followed the required process and desires to amend the Bylaws.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors that the attached Bylaws are hereby adopted as amended to supercede and replace the Bylaws adopted on March 23, 2009.

________________________
Date: ______________________
Secretary of the Board
Juli Word
Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Bylaws of the Board of Directors

BLACK Text – Current Bylaws
RED Text – Proposed language
BLUE Text - Reference

DRAFT – REDLINE & ANNOTATED
October 2017
Article 1 – The Authority

Section 1.1. Creation. Pursuant to the provisions of Article 1118x, Texas Revised Civil Statutes, as amended and recodified as Chapter 451 of the Texas Transportation Code (“Code”), and pursuant to a favorable vote of the qualified voters in a confirmation and tax election held January 19, 1985, a metropolitan rapid transit authority, is created and exists in the City of Austin, Texas, constituting the environs of the “principal city” as defined herein, and any other such areas that may subsequently vote to join the Authority. The Authority is a political subdivision of the state of Texas. Pursuant to Section 451.107 of the Code, power is granted to the Authority’s Board of Directors to adopt rules and regulations and such bylaws as it may deem necessary.

Section 1.2. Name. The name of the Authority shall be the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority (“Authority”).

Section 1.3. Purpose and General Powers. The purpose of the Authority shall be to plan, develop and operate public transportation services within the territory of the Authority and to exercise any other powers and duties as allowed or specified in the Code, and other applicable state and federal law. The Authority shall constitute a political entity and corporate public body corporate and politic, exercising public and essential governmental functions, having the powers necessary or convenient to carry out and effectuate the purposes and provisions of the Code. [Match statute § 451.052]

Section 1.4. Territory. The territory of the Authority shall constitute the corporate limits of the City of Austin, being the principal city; the corporate limits of the following incorporated municipalities within Travis County: Lago Vista, Point Venture, Volente, San Leanna, Manor and Jonestown; the following incorporated municipalities located within Williamson County: Leander; the portion of Commissioner’s Precinct Number 1 of unincorporated portion of Williamson County known as Anderson Mill and defined as Williamson County voting precincts 5, 17, 18 and 39; and Commissioner’s Precinct Number 2 of unincorporated Travis County; and any other town or county area wherein the voters elect to become a part of the Authority pursuant to Sec. 451.552 of the Code. [Match current service area]

Article 2 – The Board of Directors

Section 2.1. Governing Body. The governing body of the Authority shall be the Board of Directors (“Board”). The responsibility for the management, control and operation of the Authority and its properties is vested in the Board.

Section 2.2 Powers of the Board.

2.2.1 The Board shall exercise its responsibility as the governing body of the Authority by adopting all general policies of the Authority, including the adoption of annual capital and operating budgets, the establishment of the goals of the Authority, adoption of a strategic plan, [§451.135] and the selection and performance evaluation of a general manager (President/Chief Executive Officer) and a qualified individual to perform internal auditing services. [Match statute – §451.458]

2.2.2 Rules and Regulations. The Board may adopt and enforce rules and regulations for such purposes as provided in Section 451.107 of the Code. All rules and regulations established by the Board shall be published and made available for public review in accordance with the Code.

2.2.3 The Board shall adopt and impose reasonable and nondiscriminatory fares and charges for the use of the system and shall have the authority to enforce fares for the use of the system. [§§451.061 and .0611]
2.2.4 In addition to the statutory authority provided to the President/Chief Executive Officer, the Board may delegate certain duties and responsibilities to the President/Chief Executive Officer for the management and operation of Authority. [§451.106 and Res. 1992-147]

Section 2.3. Members of the Board of Directors

2.3.1 Oath of Office. The oath of office shall be given to all members of the Board before commencement of duties as a member of the Board. [Tex. Const. Article 16, Sec. 1]

2.3.2 Duties. Board members shall act collectively on behalf of the Board in the best interest of the Authority and in accordance with the constitutions and laws of the United States of America and the State of Texas and within policies adopted by the Board. No individual Board member is authorized to bind the Authority by their statements or actions. [Statute and current practice]

2.3.3 Membership. The members of the Board shall be resident citizens and “registered” voter residing within the boundaries of the Authority. The term, criteria for eligibility for membership and appointment process are established in Section 451.5021, Tex. Transp. Code. [Match statute]

2.3.4. Attendance. Each member of the Board is expected to serve faithfully and attend all meetings. A board member may be removed from office for absence, without having been excused by a majority vote of the board, from more than one-half of the regularly scheduled board meetings that the member is eligible to attend during a calendar year. [§451.510(6)]

2.3.5. Removal. Any member may be removed from the Board by a majority vote of the other members of the board because of a ground for removal described by Section 451.510 or by a majority vote of the entity agency that appointed the member because of a ground for removal described by Section 451.510 of the Code. pursuant to Sections 451.509, .510 and .511 of the Code for inefficiency, neglect of duty or malfeasance in office. The person or entity proposing to remove a board member pursuant to Section 451.510 must give the member a written statement of the grounds for removal and the member is entitled to a hearing in accordance with Section 451.511 of the Code. [Match statute]

2.3.6. Vacancies. A member may resign their position on the Board by submitting a written resignation to the Chair or the entity that appointed the member. A resignation is effective upon receipt by the Chair or upon a date specified by the member. All vacancies occurring on the Board shall be filled for the remainder of the term by the same person or entity agency that made the original appointment for the vacant position. [Match current practice]

2.3.7. Conflict and Disclosure of Interest. Members of the Board shall comply with all state laws and the Capital Metro Code of Conduct regarding conflicts of interest and disclosure of interests, including but not limited to, Chapter 171, Local Government Code. Members with a potential conflict of interest under the law or Code of Conduct or whose personal interests may create an appearance of a conflict of interest are required to file an affidavit with the Board Secretary or his/her designee and must not vote or participate in the Board’s discussion of the matter. A member’s personal interests may create an appearance of a conflict of interest if it would appear to a reasonable person that the member’s personal interests were inconsistent with the public’s interest or the decision would directly or indirectly benefit the member greater than the benefit to the general public. [Match statute and best practices]

A member may identify a potential conflict of interest of a fellow member to the Chair or Vice Chair for discussion by the Board. [Match current practice]

2.3.8. Indemnification. Each Board Member shall be defended by the Authority against any action, suit or proceeding arising from an act or omission alleged to have been committed by the Board Member within the scope of the individual’s official capacity to the full extent allowed by applicable law. [Best practice]
Article 3 – Officers of the Board

Section 3.1. Election of Officers. The members of the Board shall elect from among their number a Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson, and a Secretary. Such officer of the Board shall be elected annually, generally at the first regular January meeting of the Board for the terms to expire at the first regular meeting of the Board in the succeeding year.

Section 3.2. Vacancy. The members of the Board shall fill any vacancy in any office of the Board by election, such appointment to continue until the expiration of the current term of the office which becomes vacant.

Section 3.3. Removal. An officer of the Board may be removed as an officer by a vote of a majority of all appointed and qualified the other members of the Board. [Best practice - Match statute]

Section 3.4. Powers and Duties of Board Officers.

3.4.1. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Board; shall determine by inspection and investigation if orders and resolutions promulgated by the Board are being carried into effect, and may report from time to time his or her findings to the Board; may sign and execute for and on behalf of the Authority contracts of insurance, bonds, deeds, mortgages, debentures, contracts or any other instruments or documents of whatever nature that the Board has authorized him or her to execute; with the assistance of the President/Chief Executive Officer, shall establish the proposed agenda for each meeting of the Board; shall recommend the Chairperson, members and tenure of all Board committees, provided such appointments are made with the concurrence of the members of the Board; shall perform all duties prescribed for the Chairperson by these bylaws or assigned from time to time by the Board.

3.4.2. The Vice Chairperson shall preside at any meeting of the Board when the Chairperson is absent and shall perform the duties of the Chairperson in case of the absence, disability or disqualification of the Chairperson or when requested to perform such duties by the Chairperson, and shall perform such other duties as may from time to time be assigned to him or her by the Chairperson of the Board. The Vice Chairperson shall serve as the Ethics Officer for the Board receiving and responding to potential ethics concerns raised by members of the Board or the President/CEO. [Code of Conduct]

3.4.3. The Secretary shall certify keep the permanent records of all proceedings and transactions of the Authority, including resolutions. In the absence of the Secretary, the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson may certify records of the Authority. The Secretary shall keep the minutes of all official meetings of the Board, and see that notices are duly given in accordance with the provisions of these bylaws or as may be required by law with the assistance of or delegate such responsibility to the Board support staff. The Secretary shall perform the duties of the Chairperson in case of the absence, disability or disqualification of the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson. [NEW proposal - Current practice]

Section 3.5. Appointment of Board Members to outside boards or organizations. The Chairperson shall approve any requests for members of the Board to represent Capital Metro in an official capacity on local, state or national transit-related committees, boards, organizations or associations. (Resolution 2010-69)

Article 4 – Meetings

Section 4.1. Open Meetings. The Board shall be subject to and comply with Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code, the Texas Open Meetings Act. [§451.514]
Section 4.2. Closed Session. Closed Executive sessions may be held by the Board in compliance with the provisions of the Texas Open Meetings Act. Members shall protect the confidentiality of all communications and information discussed or presented during closed session and not reveal, divulge, or disclose communications or information unless required by law. [Match statute – current practice]

Section 4.3. Establishment of Place, Date and Time. Regular meetings of the Board shall be held at least monthly at a date, time and place designated by the Board by resolution. [§451.514]

Section 4.4. Quorum. A majority of all appointed and qualified members of the Board shall constitute a quorum of the Board for the purpose of conducting its business and exercising its powers, except as otherwise specified in these bylaws. If a quorum is not present at any meeting of the Board, a majority of the Board members present at any meeting may adjourn the meeting to another time and place provided that all members of the Board are notified in writing of the change in the time and place of the meeting, and the meeting is posted in compliance with the Texas Open Meetings Act. Temporary absence from the meeting room that results in less than a quorum present in the room does not halt a meeting but a vote may not be taken. [Match statute – Robert’s Rules of Order]

Section 4.5. Public Involvement. Subject to requirements prescribed by the Board, any citizen may address the Board at a meeting. [§451.138]

Section 4.6. Decorum. The Board may establish guidelines reasonably necessary to maintain order and protect health and safety. The Chair shall assure that order and decorum are maintained in the meetings. [§451.517 - Best practice]

Section 4.7. Public Hearings. Public hearings shall be held by the Board before the adoption of the annual budget and as such other hearings are deemed appropriate or necessary by the Board, at such times and places as set by the Board. Copies of the budget, and other items being considered at the public hearing shall be made available for public review according to the provisions of the Code and policies set by the Board. [Copies shall be available at the main office of the Authority and at offices of the local entities within the Authority.] [Not necessary]

Article 5 – Conduct of Business

Section 5.1. Meeting Procedures. All meetings of the Board and Board committees shall be conducted in compliance with the rules contained in the current version of Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised to the extent that said rules are not inconsistent with these bylaws and any procedures or policies the Board may adopt.

Section 5.2. Request to call a meeting or add an agenda item. Special meetings of the Board should be called by the Chairperson of the Board and shall be called by the Chairperson upon the written request of two members of the Board or the President/Chief Executive Officer. Additional items shall be placed on the Board agenda upon the request of two members of the Board to the Chairperson.

Section 5.3. Consideration of Consent Agenda Items. The Board may consider and approve routine, noncontroversial items on a consent agenda. The Board shall adopt items on the Consent Agenda by a single vote. Any Board member may remove an item from the Consent Agenda for
discussion and consideration on the Action Item Agenda by request to the Chair at any time prior to the vote to approve the Consent Agenda. [§451.138(a)(2) – Current practice]

Section 5.4. Voting. All action of the Board is taken by a vote and each member of the Board is expected to vote. [Best practice]

5.4.1. On any question presented, the number of members present shall be recorded by the Board Secretary or Board support staff. Provided that a quorum is present, action may be taken by the Board upon a vote of a majority of the Board members present, unless the act of a greater number shall be required by law or these bylaws. [Not applicable]

5.4.2. All votes shall be taken by voice vote unless a request for a roll call vote is made by two members of the Board prior to a vote being initiated or the Chair is unclear of the results of a voice vote. [Best practice]

5.4.3 No vote by proxy shall be permitted for any vote of the Board or for any Board committee.

Section 5.5. Minutes. The minutes shall consist primarily of a record of the actions taken. They shall not be a full transcript of the meeting but must give a true reflection of the matters discussed and the views of the participants related to any action taken. [Current/Best practice]

Article 6 – Committees of the Board

Section 6.1. Board Committees. The Board may from time to time establish Board committees/task forces made up of members of the Board with specific duties, terms and responsibilities. [Clarity]

Section 6.1.1. Membership on Board Committees. The Chairperson shall nominate the Committee Chairperson and members of the Board committees annually, subject to approval confirmation by the Board. The Committee shall elect a Committee Vice Chairperson from among its members at its first meeting of the year to perform the duties of the Chairperson in case of the absence, disability or disqualification of the Committee Chairperson. [Current practice – NEW proposal]

6.1.2. Role of Board Committees. The Board may refer any matter to the Board Committee for consideration. The Board Committee shall study and make recommendations for action to the full Board of Directors. The Board Committee shall have no power to bind the Authority with its decisions or recommendations. [Current practice]

6.1.3. Charter Statement. The Board Committee shall adopt a Charter Statement that will be reviewed periodically which identifies the Committee’s areas of responsibility and oversight. [Board resolution]

6.1.4. Meetings. The Board Committee shall meet as needed to conduct its business. [Best practice]

Section 6.2. Ad Hoc Committees or Task Forces. The Board from time to time may establish ad hoc committees or task forces made up of members of the Board and/or members of the community to study and make recommendations on matters of interest to the Authority. The Board shall determine at the time of establishment the membership and roles and responsibilities of the Ad Hoc Committee or Task Force. [Separated for clarity]

Article 7 - Citizen Advisory Committees

Section 7.1. Creation. An advisory committee shall be established consisting of resident citizens of the Authority’s territory. The Citizen Advisory Committee shall have a structure, duties and
responsibilities as may be determined by the Board. The Board may from time to time establish other advisory committees/taskforces that may include citizen members. The Board may from time to time establish citizen advisory committees or taskforces that may include citizen members. The citizen advisory committees shall have a structure, duties and responsibilities as may be determined by the Board and in accordance with Section 451.109, Tex. Transp. Code. The citizen advisory committees may study and make recommendations to the Board but shall not have any power to bind the Authority or direct staff. Elected officials and candidates may not serve on advisory committees. [Res. 2010-67]

**Article 8 – Business Administration**

**Section 8.1. Fiscal Year.** The fiscal year of the Authority shall begin and end on such dates as the Board at any time shall determine by resolution. However, the fiscal year shall not be changed more than once in a five-year period. The fiscal year shall begin on the first day of October and end on the last day of September of the subsequent year. [Best practice]

**Section 8.2. Budget.** Prior to the commencement of a fiscal year, the Board shall adopt an annual budget in a format and with such detail as determined by the Board. Before the Board adopts its annual budget, it shall conduct a public hearing and shall make the proposed annual budget available to the public at least fourteen days prior to the hearing. The Authority may not make operating expenditures in excess of the total amount specified for operating expenditures for a fiscal year unless the Board amends the operating budget by resolution after public notice and hearing. [Match statute]

**Section 8.3. Capital Improvement Plan.** The Board shall adopt a five-year plan for capital improvement projects. The Board shall hold a public meeting on a proposed capital improvement plan before adopting it and must make the plan available to the public for review and comment. The Board shall annually reevaluate, and if necessary, amend the plan to ensure compliance with Section 451.132 of the Code. [Statute]

**Section 8.4. Annual Financial Audit.** The Board each year shall have prepared an audit of its affairs in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by an independent certified public accountant or a firm of independent certified public accountants, which shall be open to public inspection. Such auditors shall have no personal interest directly or indirectly in the fiscal affairs of the Authority and shall be experienced and qualified in accounting and auditing of public bodies. It is provided, however, that the Authority’s auditors may not undertake consulting services for the Authority in addition to their duties in connection with the annual audit without the prior consent of the Board to ensure the services do not create a potential conflict of interest and/or improper influence on the annual audit. [Best practice]

**Section 8.5. Investment Authority.** The Board shall have all necessary investment authority in accordance with the Public Funds Investment Act, Section 2256, Texas Government Code. [Statute – best practice]

**Section 8.6. Policies.** The Board shall adopt all policies necessary and useful for the conduct of its business in accordance with state and federal law and regulations, including for the competition and award of contracts. The Board shall review and amend as necessary each of its policies at least every five years. [Best practice]
9 – Modification of Bylaws

These Bylaws can be amended at any regular meeting of the Board by a two-thirds vote of all the appointed and qualified members of the Board, provided that the amendment has been submitted in writing at the previous regular meeting of the Board. [Match statute]

Article 10 – Interpretation of the Bylaws

These bylaws are designed solely to facilitate the handling by the Board of Directors of its own business, and the Board of Directors retains the right to interpret these rules. No action taken by this board shall be deemed invalid because of any conflict with these rules, so long as the action taken is in accordance with any applicable law. [obligatory lawyer’s contribution]

Certificate by Secretary. The undersigned, being the Secretary of the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority, certifies that these bylaws were duly adopted by the Board of the Authority effective as of ________________ and shall supersede all past Bylaws or amended Bylaws of the Authority.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have signed this certification on the ____________________.

____________________________
Secretary
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Ridership Quarterly Summary

- System ridership down 3.9% Q4 2017 compared to Q4 2016
  - August 2017
    - Hurricane Harvey
    - Round Rock service began
    - Georgetown service realignment
    - UT Shuttle later than normal start to fall service
    - MetroRapid enhanced frequency
  - Fuel prices up 11.4% from Q4 2016
## Q4 2017 Ridership Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Q4 2016</th>
<th>Q4 2017</th>
<th>Q4 17</th>
<th>YTD 2016</th>
<th>YTD 2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Fixed Route</td>
<td>5,542,814</td>
<td>5,194,818</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>21,801,438</td>
<td>21,404,660</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Express</td>
<td>134,586</td>
<td>127,637</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td>541,470</td>
<td>527,351</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Events/Charter</td>
<td>14,227</td>
<td>8,614</td>
<td>-39.5%</td>
<td>215,850</td>
<td>158,889</td>
<td>-26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MetroAccess</td>
<td>167,791</td>
<td>170,253</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>672,825</td>
<td>674,098</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UT Shuttle</td>
<td>647,569</td>
<td>465,371</td>
<td>-28.1%</td>
<td>3,297,794</td>
<td>2,501,056</td>
<td>-24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RideShare</td>
<td>117,445</td>
<td>115,249</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>432,537</td>
<td>459,555</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MetroRail</td>
<td>195,261</td>
<td>190,040</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>807,816</td>
<td>824,703</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MetroRapid</td>
<td>678,912</td>
<td>938,561</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>2,712,657</td>
<td>3,400,358</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total System</td>
<td>7,498,605</td>
<td>7,210,541</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>30,482,386</td>
<td>29,950,671</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ridership By Mode – Q4 2017

Fixed Route w/o Express

- Fixed Route down 6.3% from Q4 2016 and down 1.8% for the fiscal year
- Riders moving to Rapid with Premium Fare eliminated and enhanced frequency on Rapid service
• Express down 5.2% from Q4 2016 and down 2.6% for the fiscal year
• Changes to Express services coming in January 2018
Ridership By Mode – Q4 2017

MetroRapid

- MetroRapid up 38.2% from Q4 2016 and up 25.4% for the fiscal year
- Elimination of Premium fare and enhanced frequency affect ridership increase
Ridership By Mode – Q4 2017
Fixed Route, Express, MetroRapid

- Fixed Route, Express, MetroRapid down 1.5% from Q4 2016
- These combined services are up 1.1% for the fiscal year
• MetroRail down 2.7% from Q4 2016 and up 2.1% for the fiscal year
• Current service at capacity during peak times
• Additional rail service coming online soon
Ridership By Mode – Q4 2017

UT Shuttle

- UT Shuttle down 28.1% from Q4 2016 and down 24.2% for the fiscal year
- A long-term detour affecting ridership on campus has been rerouted permanently
Ridership By Mode – Q4 2017
MetroAccess

- MetroAccess up 1.5% from Q4 2016 and nearly break-even for the fiscal year
- MetroAccess continues making efforts to manage ridership on this high cost service through eligibility evaluations, travel training, and pathway assessment
Ridership By Mode – Q4 2017

RideShare

- Rideshare ridership down 1.9% from Q4 2016 and up 6.2% for the fiscal year
- Continued success of RideShare program despite slow down in fourth quarter
Ridership By Mode – Q4 2017

Productivity – Riders per Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Q4 2014</th>
<th>Q4 2015</th>
<th>Q4 2016</th>
<th>Q4 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroBus</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroAccess</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Shuttle</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroRapid</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroRail</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
System Ridership – Q4 2017
Compared to Budget

- Actual ridership is 4.4% below Q4 budgeted ridership and 2.3% below budget for the fiscal year.
Business Partnerships – Q4 2017
Austin Community College

- Q4 boardings down 8.3% and down 11.2% for the fiscal year.
- Community Involvement & Marketing are working with ACC to promote Capital Metro services
Business Partnerships – Q4 2017
City of Austin

- Q4 boardings up 4% and up 14.3% for the fiscal year
- Community Involvement Team has increased outreach efforts
Business Partnerships – Q4 2017
Travis County

- Q4 boardings down slightly 0.8% and up 4.9% for the fiscal year
Round Rock and Georgetown

- Service began August 21, 2017
- First week free
- 244 average weekday boardings Aug
- 208 average weekday boardings Sep
- Operated by McDonald (now RATPDEV)

- Service realignment August 21, 2017
- First two weeks free
- 38 average weekday boardings Sep 2016
- 76 average weekday boardings Sep 2017
- Operated by CARTS
System Summary – Q4 2017

• System ridership down 3.8% from Q4 2016 and down 1.7% for the fiscal year
• Discounting UT Shuttle challenges ridership would be up 1.0 % for fiscal year
FY2017 Year-end Summary

• Portions of Connections 2025 implemented
  – Premium fare eliminated
  – MetroRapid enhanced frequency

• UT Shuttle Changes
  – Several routes on long-term detour affecting ridership near campus
  – Rerouting now permanent; do not anticipate ridership to return to previous levels

• System Ridership
  – System down 1.7%
  – Fixed Route, Express & MetroRapid combined up 1.1% from FY2016
  – Discounting UT Shuttle Challenges system would be up 1% from FY2016

• Transit Development Plans implemented
  – Round Rock
  – Georgetown

• Staff preparing for major service changes in FY2018
  – MetroExpress Routes to use Mopac Managed Lanes
  – MetroRail additional peak service
  – MetroBus (fixed route) system overhaul
TITLE: President/CEO Update